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ABSTRACT

We study the production rate of ionizing photons of a sample of 588 Hα emitters (HAEs) and 160 Lyman-α emitters (LAEs) at $z = 2.2$ in the COSMOS field in order to assess the implied emissivity from galaxies, based on their UV luminosity. By exploring the rest-frame Lyman Continuum (LyC) with GALEX/NUV data, we find $f_{\text{esc}} \approx 2.8(6.4)\%$ through median (mean) stacking. By combining the Hα luminosity density with IGM emissivity measurements from absorption studies, we find a globally averaged $(f_{\text{esc}})_{\text{global}}$ of $5.9^{+1.5}_{-4.5}\%$ at $z \approx 2.2$ if we assume HAEs are the only source of ionizing photons. We find similarly low values of the global $(f_{\text{esc}})$ at $z \approx 3 - 5$, also ruling out a high $(f_{\text{esc}})$ at $z < 5$. These low escape fractions allow us to measure $\xi_{\text{ion}}$, the number of produced ionizing photons per unit UV luminosity, and investigate how this depends on galaxy properties. We find a typical $\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{24.77\pm0.04}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$ for HAEs and $\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{-25.14^{+0.09}_{-0.06}}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$ for LAEs. LAEs and low mass HAEs at $z = 2.2$ show similar values of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$, as typically assumed in the reionization era, while the typical HAE is three times less ionizing. Due to an increasing $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ with increasing EW(Hα), $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ likely increases with redshift. This evolution alone is fully in line with the observed evolution of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ between $z \approx 2 - 5$, indicating a typical value of $\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{25.4}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$ in the reionization era.
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1 INTRODUCTION

One of the most important questions in galaxy formation is whether galaxies alone have been able to provide the ionizing photons which reionized the Universe. Optical depth measurements from the Planck satellite place the mean reionization redshift between $z \approx 7.8 - 8.8$ (Planck Collaboration et al. 2016). The end-point of reionization has been marked by the Gun-Peterson trough in high-redshift quasars at $z \approx 5 - 6$, with a typical neutral fraction of $\sim 10^{-4}$ (e.g. Fan et al. 2006; McGreer et al. 2015). Moreover, recent observations indicate that there are large opacity fluctuations among various sight-lines, indicating an inhomogeneous nature of reionization (Becker et al. 2015).

Assessing whether galaxies have been the main provider of ionizing photons at $z \gtrsim 5$ (alternatively to Active Galactic Nuclei, AGN; e.g. Madau & Haardt 2015; Giallongo et al. 2015; Weigel et al. 2015) crucially depends on i) precise measurements of the number of galaxies at early cosmic times, ii) the clumping factor of the IGM (e.g. Pawlik et al. 2015), iii) the amount of ionizing photons that is produced (Lyman-Continuum photons, LyC, $\lambda < 912\AA$) and iv) the fraction of ionizing photons that escapes into the inter galactic medium (IGM). All these numbers are currently uncertain, with the relative uncertainty greatly rising from i) to iv).

Many studies so far have focussed on counting the number of galaxies as a function of their UV luminosity (lumi-
nosity functions) at \( z > 7 \) \citep[e.g.][]{McLure2013, Bowler2014, Atek2015, Bouwens2015a, Finkelstein2015, Ishigaki2015, McLeod2015, Castellano2016, Livermore2016}. These studies typically infer luminosity functions with steep faint-end slopes, and a steepening of the faint-end slope with increasing redshift \citep[see for example the recent review from][]{Finkelstein2015}, leading to a high number of faint galaxies. Assuming “standard” values for the other parameters such as the escape fraction, simplistic models indicate that galaxies may indeed have provided the ionizing photons to reionize the Universe \citep[e.g.][]{Madau1999, Robertson2015}, and that the ionizing background at \( z \approx 5 \) is consistent with the derived emissivity from galaxies \citep{Choudhury2015, Bouwens2015b}. However, without validation of input assumptions regarding the production and escape of ionizing photons \citep[for example, these simplistic models assume that the escape fraction does not depend on UV luminosity], the usability of these models remains to be evaluated.

The most commonly adopted escape fraction of ionizing photons, \( f_{\text{esc}} \), is 10–20\%, independent of mass or luminosity \citep[e.g.][]{Mitra2015, Robertson2015}. However, hydrodynamical simulations indicate that \( f_{\text{esc}} \) is likely very anisotropic and time dependent \citep{Cen2015, Ma2015}. An escape fraction which depends on galaxy properties \citep[for example a higher \( f_{\text{esc}} \) for lower mass galaxies, e.g.][]{Paardekooper2015} would influence the way reionization happened \citep[e.g.][]{Sharma2016}. Most importantly, it is impossible to measure \( f_{\text{esc}} \) directly at high-redshift \(( z > 6 )\) because of the high opacity of the IGM for ionizing photons \citep[e.g.][]{Inoue2014}. Furthermore, to estimate \( f_{\text{esc}} \) it is required that the intrinsic amount of ionizing photons is measured accurately, which requires accurate understanding of the stellar populations, SFR and dust attenuation \citep[i.e.][]{DeBarros2016}.

Nevertheless, several attempts have been made to measure \( f_{\text{esc}} \), both in the local Universe \citep[e.g.][]{Leitherer1995, Deharveng2001, Leitet2013, Alexander2013} and at intermediate redshift, \( z \approx 3 \), where it is possible to observe redshifted LyC radiation with optical CCDs \citep[e.g.][]{Inoue2006, Boutsia2011, Vanzella2012, Bergvall2013, Mostardi2015}. However, the number of reliable direct detections is limited to a handful, both in the local Universe and at intermediate redshift \citep[e.g.][]{Borthakur2014, Izotov2015b, DeBarros2016, Leitherer2016}, and strong limits of \( f_{\text{esc}} \lesssim 5 – 10\% \) exist for the majority \citep[e.g.][]{Grazian2016, Guaita2016, Rutkowski2016}. An important reason is that contamination from sources in the foreground may mimic escaping LyC, and high resolution UV imaging is thus required \citep[e.g.][]{Mostardi2015, Siana2015}. Even for sources with established LyC leakage, estimating \( f_{\text{esc}} \) reliably depends on the ability to accurately estimate the intrinsically produced amount of LyC photons and precisely model the transmission of the IGM \citep[e.g.][]{Vanzella2016}.

The amount of ionizing photons that are produced per unit UV \citep[rest-frame \( \approx 1500\, \AA \)]{nosity functions} luminosity \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) is generally calculated using SED modelling \citep[e.g.][]{Madau1999, Bouwens2012, Kuhlen2012} or \citep[in a related method] estimated from the observed values of the UV slopes of high-redshift galaxies \citep[e.g.][]{Robertson2013, Duncan2015}. Most of these studies find values around \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{25.2 - 25.5}\, \text{Hz}\, \text{erg}^{-1}\, \text{at} \, z \approx 8 \). More recently, \cite{Bouwens2016} estimated the number of ionizing photons in a sample of Lyman break galaxies (LBGs) at \( z \approx 4 \) to be \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{25.3}\, \text{Hz}\, \text{erg}^{-1} \) by estimating H\alpha luminosities with Spitzer/IRAC photometry.

Progress in the understanding of \( f_{\text{esc}} \) and \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) can be made by expanding the searched parameter space to lower redshifts, where rest-frame optical emission lines \citep[e.g.][]{Halpha} can provide valuable information on the production rate of LyC photons and where it is possible to obtain a complete selection of star-forming galaxies.

In this paper, we use a large sample of H\alpha emitters \citep[HAEs] and Ly\alpha emitters \citep[LAEs] at \( z \approx 2.2 \) to constrain \( f_{\text{esc}} \) and measure \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) and how this may depend on galaxy properties. Our measurements of \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) rely on the assumption that \( f_{\text{esc}} \) is negligible \(< 10\% \), which we validate by constraining \( f_{\text{esc}} \) with archival GALEX NUV imaging and by comparing the estimated emissivity of HAEs with IGM emissivity measurements from quasar absorption lines \citep[e.g.][]{Becker2013}. Combined with rest-frame UV photometry, accurate measurements of \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) are possible on a source by source basis for HAEs, allowing us to explore correlations with galaxy properties. Since only a handful of LAEs are detected in H\alpha \citep[see][]{Matthee2016}, we measure the median \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) from stacks of Lyman-\alpha emitters from \cite{Sobral2016}.

We describe the galaxy sample and definitions of galaxy properties in §2. §3 presents the GALEX imaging. We present upper limits on \( f_{\text{esc}} \) in §4. We indirectly estimate \( f_{\text{esc}} \) from the H\alpha luminosity function and the IGM emissivity in §5 and measure the ionizing properties of galaxies and its redshift evolution in §6. §7 discusses the implications for reionization. Finally, our results are summarised in §8.

We adopt a CDM cosmology with \( H_0 = 70\, \text{km}\, \text{s}^{-1}\, \text{Mpc}^{-1} \), \( \Omega_M = 0.3 \) and \( \Omega_L = 0.7 \). Magnitudes are in the AB system. At \( z = 2.2 \), 1″ corresponds to a physical scale of 8.2 kpc.

## 2 Galaxy Sample

We use a sample of H\alpha selected star-forming galaxies from the High-z Emission Line Survey \citep[HIZELS;][]{Geach2008, Sobral2009} at \( z = 2.2 \) in the COSMOS field. These galaxies were selected using narrow-band (NB) imaging in the K band with the United Kingdom InfraRed Telescope. H\alpha emitters (HAEs) were identified among the line-emitters using BzK and BR' colours and photometric redshifts, as described in \cite{Sobral2013}, and thus have a photometric redshift of \( z = 2.22 \pm 0.02 \) where the error is due to the width of the narrow-band filter. In total, there are 588 H\alpha emitters at \( z = 2.2 \) in COSMOS.\footnote{The sample of H\alpha emitters from \cite{Sobral2013} is publicly available through e.g. VizieR, http://vizier.cfa.harvard.edu.}

HAEs are selected to have \( EW_{\text{H} \alpha - \text{NB}} > 25\, \AA \). Since the COSMOS field has been covered by multiple narrow-band filters, a fraction of \( z = 2.2 \) sources are detected with multiple major emission lines in addition to H\alpha: [OII], [OIII] \citep[e.g.][]{Sobral2012, Nakajima2012, Sobral2013} or Ly\alpha \citep[e.g.][]{Oto2015, Matthee2016}.
Multi-wavelength photometry from the observed UV to mid-IR is widely available in COSMOS. In this paper, we make explicit use of V and R band in order to measure the UV luminosity and UV slope $\beta$ (see §2.1.3), but all bands have been used for photometric redshifts (see Sobral et al. 2013, and e.g. Ilbert et al. 2009) and SED fitting (Sobral et al. 2014; Oteo et al. 2015; Khostovan et al. 2016).

We also include 160 Lyman-α emitters (LAEs) at $z = 2.2$ from the CALibrating LYMAn-α with Hα survey (CALYMH; Matthee et al. 2016; Sobral et al. 2016a). For completeness at bright luminosities, LAEs were selected with EW$_{\text{L, Lyα}} > 5 \text{ Å}$, while LAEs are typically selected with a higher EW$_{\text{L, Lyα}}$ cut of 25 Å (see e.g. Matthee et al. 2015 and references therein). Only 15% of our LAEs have EW$_{\text{L, Lyα}} < 25 \text{ Å}$ and these are typically AGN, see Sobral et al. (2016a), but they represent some of the brightest. We note that 40% of LAEs are too faint to be detected in broad-bands, and we thus have only upper limits on their stellar mass and UV magnitude (see Fig. 1). By design, CALYMH observations both Ly$\alpha$ and H$\alpha$ for HAE selected galaxies. As presented in Matthee et al. (2016), 17 HAEs are also detected in Ly$\alpha$ with the current depth of Ly$\alpha$ narrow-band imaging. These are considered as HAEs in the remainder of the paper.

We show the general properties of our sample of galaxies in Fig. 1. It can be seen that compared to HAEs, LAEs are typically somewhat fainter in the UV, have a lower mass and lower SFR, although they are also some of the brightest UV objects.

Our sample of HAEs and LAEs was chosen for the following reasons: i) all are at the same redshift slice where the LyC can be observed with the GALEX NUV filter and H$\alpha$ with the NBK$_{\text{H}}$ filter, ii) the sample spans a large range in mass, star formation rate (SFR) and environments (Fig. 1 and Geach et al. 2012; Sobral et al. 2014) and iii) as discussed in Oteo et al. (2015), H$\alpha$ selected galaxies span the entire range of star-forming galaxies, from dust-free to relatively dust-rich (unlike e.g. Lyman-break galaxies).

### 2.1 Definition of galaxy properties

We define the galaxy properties that are used in the analysis in this subsection. These properties are either obtained from: (1) SED fitting of the multi-wavelength photometry, (2) observed H$\alpha$ flux, or (3) observed rest-frame UV photometry.

#### 2.1.1 SED fitting

For HAEs, stellar masses ($M_{\text{star}}$) and stellar dust attenuations ($E(B-V)$) are taken from Sobral et al. (2014). In this study, synthetic galaxy SEDs are simulated with Bruzual & Charlot (2003) stellar templates with metallicities ranging from $Z = 0.0001 - 0.05$, following a Chabrier (2003) initial mass function (IMF) and with exponentially declining star formation histories (with e-folding times ranging from 0.1 to 10 Gyr). The dust attenuation is described by a Calzetti (2000) law. The observed UV to IR photometry is then fitted to these synthetic SEDs. The values of $M_{\text{star}}$ and $E(B-V)$ that we use are the median values of all synthetic models which have a $\chi^2$ within 1σ of the best fitted model. The 1σ uncertainties are typically 0.1 – 0.2 dex for $M_{\text{star}}$ and 0.05-0.1 dex for $E(B-V)$. The smallest errors are found at high masses and high extinctions. The same SED fitting method is applied to the photometry of LAEs.

We note that the SED fitting from Sobral et al. (2014) uses SED models which do not take contribution from nebular emission lines into account. This means that some stellar masses could be over-estimated. However, the SED fits have been performed on over $> 20$ different filters, such that even if a few filters are contaminated by emission lines, the $\chi^2$ values are not strongly affected. Importantly, the Spitzer/IRAC bands (included in SED fitting and most important for measuring stellar mass at $z = 2.2$) are unaffected by strong nebular emission lines at $z = 2.2$.

We still investigate the importance of emission lines further by comparing the SED results with those from Oteo et al. (2015), who performed SED fits for a subsample ($\approx 60\%$) of the HAEs and LAEs, including emission lines.
We find that the stellar masses and dust attenuations correlate very well, although stellar masses from Oteo et al. (2015) are on average lower by 0.15 dex. We look at the galaxies with the strongest lines (highest observed EWs) and find that the difference in the stellar mass is actually smaller than for galaxies with low Hα EW. This indicates that the different mass estimates are not due to the inclusion of emission lines, but rather due to the details of the SED fitting implementation, such as the age-grid ages and allowed range of metallicities. We therefore use the stellar masses from Sobral et al. (2014). Our sample spans galaxies with masses $M_{\text{star}} \approx 10^{7.5-12}$ $M_\odot$, see Fig. 1.

### 2.1.2 Intrinsic Hα luminosity

The intrinsic Hα luminosity is used to compute instantaneous star formation rates (SFRs) and the number of produced ionizing photons. To measure the intrinsic Hα luminosity, we first correct the observed line-flux in the NB599 filter for the contribution of the adjacent [Nii] emission-line doublet. We also correct the observed line-flux for attenuation due to dust.

We correct for the contribution from [Nii] using the relation between [Nii]/Hα and EW$_{\text{H}_\alpha}$ from Sobral et al. (2012). This relation is confirmed to hold up to at least $z \sim 1$ (Sobral et al. 2015) and the median ratio of [Nii]/Hα + [Nii] = 0.19 ± 0.06 is consistent with spectroscopic follow-up at $z \approx 2$ (e.g. Swinbank et al. 2012; Sanders et al. 2015), such that we do not expect that metallicity evolution between $z = 1 - 2$ has a strong effect on the applied correction. For 1 out of the 588 HAEs we do not detect the continuum in the K band, such that we use the 1σ detection limit in K to estimate the EW and the contribution from [Nii]. We apply the same correction to HAEs that are detected as X-ray AGN (see Matthee et al. 2016 for details on the AGN identification).

If we alternatively use the relation between stellar mass and [Nii]/Hα from Erb et al. (2006) at $z \sim 2$, we find [Nii]/Hα + [Nii] = 0.10 ± 0.03. This different [Nii] estimate is likely caused by the lower metallicity of the Erb et al. (2006) sample, which may be a selection effect (UV selected galaxies typically have less dust than Hα selected galaxies, and are thus also expected to be more metal poor, i.e. Oteo et al. 2015). The difference in [Nii] contributions estimated either from the EW or mass is smaller for higher mass HAEs, which have a higher metallicity. Due to the uncertainties in the [Nii] correction we add 50 % of the correction to the uncertainty in the Hα luminosity in quadrature.

### 2.1.3 Rest-frame UV photometry and UV slopes

For our galaxy sample at $z = 2.2$, the rest-frame UV ($\sim 1500$A) is traced by the V band, which is not contaminated by (possibly) strong Lyα emission. Our full sample of galaxies is imaged in the optical V and R filters with Subaru Suprime-Cam as part of the COSMOS survey (Taniguchi et al. 2007). The 5σ depths of V and R are 26.2-26.4 AB magnitude (see e.g. Muzzin et al. 2013) and have a FWHM of $\sim 0.8''$. The typical HAE in our sample has a V band magnitude of $\sim 25$ and is thus significantly detected. 5-7 % of the HAEs in our sample are not detected in either the V or R band.

We correct the UV luminosities from the V band for dust with the Calzetti et al. (2000) attenuation curve and the fitted $E(B-V)$ values. The absolute magnitude, $M_{1500}$, is obtained by subtracting a distance modulus of $\mu = 44.97$ (obtained from the luminosity distance and corrected for bandwidth stretching with 2.5log$_{10}(1+z)$, $z = 2.23$) from the observed V band magnitudes. The UV slope $\beta$ is measured with observed V and R magnitudes following:

$$\beta = - \frac{V - R}{2.5\log_2(1+z)} - 2 \quad (1)$$

Here, $\lambda_V = 5477.83$ Å, the effective wavelength of the V filter and $\lambda_R = 6288.71$ Å, the effective wavelength of the R filter. With this combination of filters, $\beta$ is measured around a rest-frame wavelength of $\sim 1800$ Å.

### 3 GALEX UV DATA

For galaxies observed at $z = 2.2$, rest-frame LyC photons can be observed with the NUV filter on the GALEX space telescope. In COSMOS there is deep GALEX data (3σ AB magnitude limit $\sim 25.2$, see e.g. Martin et al. 2005; Muzzin et al. 2013) available from the public Deep Imaging Survey. We stress that the full width half maximum (FWHM) of the point spread function (PSF) of the NUV imaging is 5.4′′ (Martin et al. 2003) and that the pixel scale is 1.5′′ pix$^{-1}$. We have acquired NUV images in COSMOS from the Mikulski Archive at the Space Telescope Science Institute (MAST)$^2$. All HAEs and LAEs in COSMOS are covered by GALEX observations, due to the large circular field of view with 1.25 degree diameter. Five pointings in the COSMOS field overlap in the center, which results in a total median exposure time of 91.4 ks and a maximum exposure time of 236.8 ks.

---

$^2$ https://mast.stsci.edu/
the observed flux in the NUV filter that originates from $\lambda_0 > 912$ Å depends on the galaxy’s SED, the IGM transmission and the filter transmission. In order to estimate this contribution, we first use a set of STARBURST99 (Leitherer et al. 1999) SED models to estimate the shape of the galaxy’s SED in the far UV. We assume a single burst of star formation with a Salpeter IMF with upper mass limit 100 $M_\odot$, Geneva stellar templates without rotation (Mowlavi et al. 2012) and metallicity $Z = 0.02$. Then, we convolve this SED with the filter and IGM transmission curves, to obtain the fraction of the flux in the NUV filter that is non-ionizing at $z = 2.2$ (compared to the flux in the NUV filter that is ionizing). By using the SED models with $H_\alpha$ EWs within our measured range, we find that 2.6 ± 0.4 % of the flux observed in the NUV filter is not-ionizing. This means that upper limits from non-detections are slightly over-estimated. For individually detected sources it is theoretically possible that the NUV detection is completely due to non-ionizing flux, depending on the SED shape and normalisation. This is analysed in detail on a source-by-source basis in Appendix A.

4 THE ESCAPE FRACTION OF IONIZING PHOTONS

4.1 How to measure $f_{esc}$?

Assuming that LyC photons escape through holes in the ISM (and hence that HII regions are ionization bounded from which no ionizing photons escape), the escape fraction, $f_{esc}$, can be measured directly from the ratio of observed to produced LyC luminosity (averaged over the solid angle of the measured aperture).

In this framework, produced LyC photons either escape the ISM, ionise neutral gas (leading to recombination radiation) or are absorbed by dust (e.g. Bergvall et al. 2006). The number of produced ionizing photons per second, $Q_{ion}$, can be estimated from the strength of the (dusted corrected) $H_\alpha$ emission line as follows:

$$L_{H\alpha} = Q_{ion} c \alpha (1 - f_{esc} - f_{ion})$$

where $Q_{ion}$ is in $s^{-1}$, $L_{H\alpha}$ is in erg $s^{-1}$, $f_{ion}$ is the fraction of produced ionizing photons that escapes the galaxy and $f_{ion}$ is the fraction of produced ionizing photons that is absorbed by dust. For case B recombinations with a temperature of $T_e = 10,000$ K, $c \alpha = 1.36 \times 10^{-12}$ erg (e.g. Kennicutt 1998; Schaerer 2003). Since the dust attenuation curve at wavelengths below 912 Å is highly uncertain, we follow the approach of Rutkowski et al. (2016), who use $f_{dust} = 0.5$, which is based on the mean value derived by Inoue (2002) in local galaxies.

Rest-frame LyC photons are redshifted into the NUV filter at $z = 2.2$. However, the IGM between $z = 2.2$ and our telescopes is not transparent to LyC photons (see Fig. 2), such that we need to correct the observed LyC luminosity for IGM absorption. The observed luminosity in the NUV filter ($L_{NUV}$) is then related to the produced number of ionizing photons as:

$$L_{NUV} = Q_{ion} \epsilon f_{esc} T_{IGM,NUV}$$

Here, $\epsilon$ is the average energy of an ionizing photon observed.

3 http://irsa.ipac.caltech.edu/data/COSMOS/
in the NUV filter (which traces rest-frame wavelengths from 550 to 880 Å, see Fig. 2). Using the STARBURST09 models as described in §3.2, we find that ε is a strong function of age, but that it is strongly correlated with the EW of the Hα line (which itself is also a strong function of age). For the range of Hα EWs in our sample, ε = 17.04±0.26 eV. We therefore take ε = 17.0 eV.

\[ T_{\text{IGM,NUV}} = \text{the absorption of LyC photons due to the intervening IGM, convolved with the NUV filter. Note that } T_{\text{IGM}} = e^{-\tau_{\text{IGM}}}, \text{ where } \tau_{\text{IGM}} \text{ is the optical depth to LyC photons in the IGM, see e.g. Vanzella et al. (2012). The IGM transmission depends on the wavelength and redshift. According to the model of Inoue et al. (2014), the mean IGM transmission for LyC radiation at } \lambda \sim 750 \text{ Å for a source at } z = 2.2 \text{ is } T_{\text{IGM}} \approx 40 \text{ %}. \text{ We convolve the IGM transmission as a function of observed wavelength for a source at } z = 2.2 \text{ with the normalised transmission of the NUV filter, see Fig. 2. This results in a bandpass-averaged } T_{\text{IGM,NUV}} = 40.4 \text{ %}.

Combining equations 2 and 3 results in:

\[ f_{\text{esc}} = \frac{1 - f_{\text{dust}}}{1 + \alpha T_{\text{IGM,NUV}}} \]  

where we define \( \alpha = \epsilon \sigma_{\text{NUV}} T_{\text{IGM,NUV}} \). Combining our assumed values, we estimate \( \alpha = 8.09 \). We note that \( \epsilon \) and \( \sigma_{\text{NUV}} \) are relatively insensitive to systematic uncertainties, while \( f_{\text{dust}} \) and \( T_{\text{IGM}} \) are highly uncertain for individual sources.

In addition to the absolute escape fraction of ionizing radiation, it is common to define the relative escape fraction of LyC photons to UV (\( \sim 1500 \) Å) photons, since these are most commonly observed in high redshift galaxies. Following Steidel et al. (2001), the relative escape fraction, \( f_{\text{esc}}^{\text{rel}} \), is defined as:

\[ f_{\text{esc}}^{\text{rel}} = f_{\text{esc}}^{\text{NUV}} e^{\text{dust,UV}} = \frac{(L_{\text{UV}}/L_{\text{NUV}})_{\text{int}} - 1}{(L_{\text{UV}}/L_{\text{NUV}})_{\text{obs}}} T_{\text{IGM,NUV}}^{-1} \]  

In this equation, \( L_{\text{UV}} \) is the luminosity in the observed V band, \( e^{\text{dust,UV}} \) is the correction for dust (see §2.1.3) and we adopt an intrinsic ratio of \( (L_{\text{UV}}/L_{\text{NUV}})_{\text{int}} = 5 \) (e.g. Siana et al. 2007). The relative escape fraction can be related to the absolute escape fraction when the dust attenuation for \( L_{\text{UV}}, A_{\text{NUV}} \), is known: \( f_{\text{esc}} = f_{\text{esc}}^{\text{rel}} \times 10^{-0.4 A_{\text{NUV}}} \).

4.2 Individual NUV detections

By matching our sample of HAEs and LAEs with the public GALEX EM cleaned catalogue (e.g. Zamojski et al. 2007; Conseil et al. 2011), we find that 33 HAEs and 5 LAEs have a detection with NUV < 26 within a separation of 1″. However, most of these matches are identified as spurious, foreground sources or significantly contaminated inside the large PSF-FWHM of NUV imaging (see Appendix A). Yet, seven of these matches (of which five are AGN) are in the CLEAN subsample without a clear foreground source and could thus potentially be LyC leakers. Because it is known that foreground contamination has been a major problem in studies of LyC leakage at \( z \sim 3 \) (e.g. Mostardi et al. 2015; Siana et al. 2015), we can only confirm the reality of these candidate LyC leakers with high resolution UV imaging with HST. We list the individual detections in Appendix A, but caution the reader that any further investigation requires these candidates to be confirmed first.

4.3 Stacks of HAEs

The majority of our sources are undetected in the NUV imaging. Therefore, in order to constrain \( f_{\text{esc}} \) for typical star-forming galaxies, we stack NUV thumbnails of our full sample of HAEs in COSMOS and also stack various subsets. We create thumbnails of 40″ × 40″ around the centre of the thumbnail (see Fig. 3) and quote the 1σ standard deviation as the depth. Apertures with a detection of NUV < 26 AB magnitude are masked (this is particularly important for mean stacking). Counts are converted to AB magnitudes with the photometric zero-point of 20.08 (Cowie et al. 2009). For mean stacking, we experiment with an iterative 5σ clipping method in order to have the background not dominated by a few luminous sources. To do this, we compute the standard deviation of the counts of the stacked sample in each pixel and ignore 5σ outliers in computing the mean value of each pixel. This is iterated five times, although we note that most of the mean values already converge after a single iteration.

By stacking only sources from the CLEAN sample and by removing X-ray AGN, the limiting NUV magnitude of the stack of CLEAN HAEs is NUV ≈ 29.7 AB (see Table 1), which translates into an upper limit of \( f_{\text{esc}} < 2.8 \text{ %} \). Mean stacking gives shallower constraints \( f_{\text{esc}} < 11.7 \text{ %} \) because the noise does not decrease as rapidly by stacking more sources, possibly because of a contribution from faint background or companion sources below the detection limit. This is improved somewhat by our iterative 5σ clipping \( f_{\text{esc}} < 6.4 \text{ %} \), which effectively masks out the contribution from bright pixels. We show the stacked thumbnails of this sample in Fig. 3.

The median (mean) upper limit on the relative escape fraction, \( f_{\text{esc,rel}} \), is much higher (\( < 92.5(231) \text{ %} \)). However, if we correct for the dust attenuation with the Calzetti et al. (2000) law, we find \( A_{\text{NUV}} \approx 3.8 \) and a dust corrected inferred escape fraction of \( < 2.8(7.0) \text{ %} \), in good agreement with our direct estimate from Hα, although we note that the additional uncertainty due to this dust correction is large.

We have experimented by stacking subsets of galaxies in bins of stellar mass, SFR and UV magnitude or LAEs, but all result in a non-detection in the NUV, all with weaker upper limits than the stack of CLEAN HAEs.

4.3.1 Systematic uncertainty due to the dust correction

In this sub-section, we investigate how sensitive our results are to the method used to correct for dust, which is the most important systematic uncertainty. In Table 1, we have used...
the SED inferred value of E(B − V) to infer A_Hα: A_Hα = E(B − V) × k_Hα, where k_Hα = 3.3277 following Calzetti et al. (2000), which results in A_Hα = 1.23. However, it is also possible to infer A_Hα from a relation with the UV slope (e.g. Meurer et al. 1999), such that A_Hα = 0.641(β + 2.23), for β > −2.23 and A_Hα = 0 for β < −2.23. Finally, we also use the relation between A_Hα and stellar mass from Garn & Best (2010), which is: A_Hα = 0.91 + 0.77X + 0.11X^2 − 0.09X^3, where X = log10(M_{star}/10^9 M_\odot). Note that we assume a Calzetti et al. (2000) dust law in all these prescriptions.

It is immediately clear that there is a large systematic uncertainty in the dust correction, as for our full sample of HAEs we infer A_Hα = 0.70 with the Garn & Best (2010) prescription and A_Hα = 0.19 following Meurer et al. (1999), meaning that the systematic uncertainty due to dust can be as large as a factor 3. Thus, these different dust corrections result in different upper limits on f_esc. For the CLEAN, star-forming HAE sample, the upper limit on f_esc from median stacking increases to f_esc < 4.4(6.6) %, using the attenuation based on stellar mass (β). With a simple 1 magnitude of extinction for Hα, f_esc < 3.4 % and without correcting for dust results in f_esc < 7.7 %.

In addition to the uncertainty in the dust correction of the Hα luminosity, another uncertainty in our method is the f_{lim} parameter introduced in Eq. 2. The dust attenuation curve at wavelengths below 912 Å is highly uncertain, such that our estimate of f_{lim} is uncertain as well. However, because our limits on f_esc from the median stack are low, the results do not change significantly by altering f_{lim}: if f_{lim} = 0.75(0.25), we find f_esc < 1.4(4.1) %. This means that as long as the limit is low, our result is not very sensitive to the exact value of f_{lim}.

5 CONSTRAINING F_{ESC} OF HAES FROM THE IONIZING BACKGROUND

In addition to constraining f_esc directly, we can obtain an indirect measurement of f esc by using the ionizing emissivity, measured from quasar absorption studies, as a constraint. The emissivity is defined as the number of escaping ionizing photons per second per comoving volume:

\[ N_{ion} = \langle f_{esc} \rangle \times \Phi(H\alpha) \times c_{H\alpha}^{-1} \]  

Here, \( N_{ion} \) is in \( s^{-1} \) Mpc\(^{-3} \), \( \langle f_{esc} \rangle \) is the escape fraction averaged over the entire galaxy population, \( \Phi(H\alpha) \) is the Hα luminosity density in \( erg \ s^{-1} \) Mpc\(^{-3} \) and \( c_{H\alpha} \) is the recombination coefficient as in Eq. 2.

We first check whether our derived emissivity using our upper limit on f_esc for HAEs is consistent with published measurements of the emissivity. The Hα luminosity density is measured in Sobral et al. (2013) as the full integral
of the Hα luminosity function, with a global dust correction of $A_{\text{Hα}} = 1.0$. Using the mean limit on $f_{\text{esc}}$ for our CLEAN sample of HAEs (so $f_{\text{esc}} \leq 6.4 \%$), we find that $N_{\text{ion}} \lesssim 1.3^{+0.2}_{-0.4} \times 10^{51} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$, where the errors come from the uncertainty in the Hα LF. We note that these numbers are relatively independent on the dust correction method because while a smaller dust attenuation would decrease the Hα luminosity density, it would also raise the upper limit on the escape fraction, thus almost cancelling out. These upper limits on $N_{\text{ion}}$ are consistent with the measured emissivity at $z = 2.4$ of Becker & Bolton (2013), who measured $N_{\text{ion}} = 0.90^{+0.60}_{-0.52} \times 10^{51} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$ (combined systematic and measurement errors) using the latest measurements of the IGM temperature and opacity to Lyα and LyC photons.

Now, by isolating $f_{\text{esc}}$ in Eq. 6, we can estimate the globally averaged escape fraction. If we assume that there is no evolution in the emissivity from Becker & Bolton (2013) on $z = 2.2$ and $z = 2.4$ and that the Hα luminosity function captures all sources of ionizing photons, we find that $f_{\text{esc}} = 4.4^{+2.1}_{-0.9} \%$ for $A_{\text{Hα}} = 1.0$. There are a number of systematic uncertainties that we will address now and add to the error bars of our final estimate. These uncertainties are: i) integration limit of the Hα LF, ii) the dust attenuation to L(Hα), iii) the conversion from L(Hα) to ionizing numbers, and iv) the [Nii] correction to the observed Hα luminosity.

Integrating the Hα LF only to SFR $\approx 3 \text{ M}_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$, we find $f_{\text{esc}} = 6.7^{+10.8}_{-5.1} \%$, such that the systematic uncertainty is of order 50 %. If $A_{\text{Hα}} = 0.7$, which is the median value when we correct for dust using stellar mass, and which may be more representative of fainter Hα emitters (as faint sources are expected to have less dust), the escape fraction is somewhat higher, with $f_{\text{esc}} = 5.9^{+2.3}_{-1.6} \%$. These numbers are summarised in Table 2. The uncertainty in $c_{\text{Hα}}$ is relatively small, as $c_{\text{Hα}}$ depends only modestly on the density and the temperature. For example, in the case of a temperature of $T = 30000 \text{ K}$, $c_{\text{Hα}}$ decreases only by $\approx 10 %$ (Schaerer 2002). This adds a 10 % uncertainty in the escape fraction. As explained in §2.1.2, there is an uncertainty in the measured Hα luminosity due to the contribution of the [Nii] doublet to the observed narrow-band flux, for which we correct using a relation with observed EW. By comparing this method with the method from Erb et al. (2006), which is based on the observed mass-metallicity relation of a sample of LBGs at $z \sim 2$, we find that the inferred Hα luminosity density would conservatively be 10 % higher, such that this correction adds another 10 % systematic uncertainty in the escape fraction.

For our final estimate of $f_{\text{esc}}$ we use the dust correction based on stellar mass, fully integrate the Hα luminosity function and add a 10 % error in quadrature for the systematic uncertainty in each of the parameters as described above, 50 % due to the uncertain integration limits and add a 40 % error due to the systematics in the dust attenuation. This results in $f_{\text{esc}} = 5.9^{+14.5}_{-4.2} \%$ at $z = 2.2$.

An additional contribution to the ionizing emissivity from rarer sources than sources with number densities $< 10^{-7} \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$ such as quasars, would lower the escape fraction for HAEs. While Madau & Haardt (2015) argue that the ionizing budget at $z \approx 2 – 3$ is dominated by quasars, this measurement may be overestimated by assuming quasars have a 100 % escape fraction. Recently, Micheva et al. (2016) obtained a much lower emissivity (up to a factor of 10) from quasars by directly measuring $f_{\text{esc}}$ for a sample of $z \sim 3$ AGN. Using a large sample of quasars at $z = 3.6 – 4.0$, Cristiani et al. (2016), measure a mean $f_{\text{esc,quasar}} \approx 70 \%$, which means that quasars do not dominate the ionizing background at $z \approx 4$. When we include a quasar contribution from Madau & Haardt (2015) in the most conservative way (meaning that we assume $f_{\text{esc}} = 100 \%$ for quasars), we find that $f_{\text{esc}} = 0.5^{+1.6}_{-0.5} \%$. If the escape fraction for quasars is 70 %, $f_{\text{esc}} = 1.6^{+1.3}_{-1.0} \%$, such that a non-zero contribution from star-forming galaxies is not ruled out.

We note that, these measurements of $f_{\text{esc}}$ contain significantly less (systematic) uncertainties than measurements based on the integral of the UV luminosity function (e.g. Becker & Bolton 2013; Khaire et al. 2016). This is because: i) UV selected galaxy samples do not necessarily span the

---

### Table 2. Measurements of ($f_{\text{esc}}$), the escape fraction of ionizing photons averaged over the galaxy population at $z \approx 2 – 5$. Constraints on the IGM emissivity from absorption studies by Becker & Bolton (2013) have been used to infer the global escape fraction. For $z = 2.2$, we have used the Ho luminosity function from Sobral et al. (2013). We have used the analytical formula from Madau & Haardt (2015) to estimate the contribution from quasars to the ionizing emissivity, which assumes that $f_{\text{esc,quasars}} = 100 \%$. At $z = 3.8$ and $z = 4.9$ we have used the SFR function from Smit et al. (2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>($f_{\text{esc}}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>full SFR integration, $A_{\text{Hα}} = 1.0$</td>
<td>$4.4^{+2.1}_{-0.9} %$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAEs $z = 2.2$</td>
<td>SFR $&gt; 3 \text{ M}<em>\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$, $A</em>{\text{Hα}} = 1.0$, full SFR integration, $A_{\text{Hα}} = 0.7$</td>
<td>$5.9^{+2.3}_{-1.6} %$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAEs $z = 2.2$</td>
<td>full SFR integration, $A_{\text{Hα}} = 0.7$, conservative systematic errors</td>
<td>$5.9^{+14.5}_{-4.2} %$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAEs $z = 2.2$</td>
<td>final estimate: full integration, $A_{\text{Hα}} = 0.7$, conservative systematic errors</td>
<td>$5.9^{+2.3}_{-0.5} %$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBGs $z = 3.8$</td>
<td>full SFR integration, Hα from Spitzer/IRAC</td>
<td>$2.7^{+2.3}_{-2.0} %$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBGs $z = 3.8$</td>
<td>full SFR integration, Hα from Spitzer/IRAC, QSO contribution</td>
<td>$4.0^{+3.0}_{-0.9} %$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBGs $z = 4.9$</td>
<td>full SFR integration, Hα from Spitzer/IRAC</td>
<td>$6.0^{+2.3}_{-0.9} %$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBGs $z = 4.9$</td>
<td>full SFR integration, Hα from Spitzer/IRAC, QSO contribution</td>
<td>$2.4^{+2.0}_{-2.1} %$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Literature

Cristiani et al. (2016) $z = 3.8$ integrated LBG LF + contribution from QSOs $5.3^{+2.7}_{-1.2} \%$
Using the methodology described in §5, we also compute the average \( f_{\text{esc}} \) at \( z = 3.8 \) and \( z = 4.9 \) by using the SFR functions of Smit et al. (2015), which are derived from UV luminosity functions, a Meurer et al. (1999) dust correction and a general offset to correct for the difference between SFR(UV) and SFR(H\( \alpha \)), estimated from Spitzer/IRAC photometry. This offset is implicitly related to the value of \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) from Bouwens et al. (2016), which is estimated from the same measurements. We combine these SFR functions, converted to the H\( \alpha \) luminosity function as in §2.1.2, with the IGM emissivity from Becker & Bolton (2013) at \( z = 4.0 \) and \( z = 4.75 \), respectively. Similarly to the H\( \alpha \) luminosity, we use the analytical integral of the Schechter function. Similarly as at \( z = 2.2 \), we conservatively increase the error bars by a factor \( \sqrt{2} \) to take systematic uncertainties into account. This results in \( \langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle = 2.7^{+1.3}_{-2.5} \% \) and \( \langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle = 6.0^{+13.9}_{-5.2} \% \) at \( z \approx 4 \) and \( z \approx 5 \), respectively, see Table 2. When including a (maximum) quasar contribution from Madau & Haardt (2015) as described above, we find \( \langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle = 0.0^{+3.0}_{-0.0} \% \) at \( z \approx 4 \) and \( \langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle = 2.1^{+2.1}_{-2.1} \% \).

As illustrated in Fig. 4, the global escape fraction is low at \( z \approx 2 - 5 \). While dust has been corrected for with different methods at \( z = 2.2 \) and \( z \approx 4 - 5 \), we note that the differences between different dust correction methods are not expected to be very large at \( z \approx 4 - 5 \). This is because higher redshift galaxies typically have lower mass, which results in a higher agreement between dust correction methods based on either \( M_{\star} \) or \( \beta \). One potentially important caveat is that our computation assumes that the Ho and UV luminosity functions include all sources of ionizing photons in addition to quasars. An additional contribution of ionizing photons from galaxies which have potentially been missed by a UV selection (for example sub-mm galaxies) would decrease the global \( f_{\text{esc}} \). Such a bias is likely more important at \( z \approx 3 - 5 \) than \( z \approx 2 \) because the \( z \approx 2 \) sample is selected with Ho which is able to recover sub-mm galaxies. Even under current uncertainties, we rule out a globally averaged \( \langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle > 20 \% \) at redshifts lower than \( z \approx 5 \).

These indirectly derived escape fractions of \( \sim 4 \% \) at \( z \approx 2 - 5 \) are consistent with recently published upper limits from Sandberg et al. (2015) at \( z = 2.2 \) and similar to strict upper limits on \( f_{\text{esc}} \) at \( z \approx 1 \) measured by Rutkowski et al. (2016), see also Cowie et al. (2009); Bridge et al. (2010). Recently, Cristiani et al. (2016) estimated that galaxies have on average \( \langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle = 5.3^{+2.7}_{-2.2} \% \) at \( z \approx 4 \) by combining IGM constraints with the UV luminosity function from Bouwens et al. (2011) and by including the contribution from quasars to the total emissivity. This result is still consistent within the error-bars with our estimate using the Madau & Haardt (2015) quasar contribution and Smit et al. (2015) SFR function. Part of this is because we use a different conversion from UV luminosity to the number of produced ionizing photons based on Ho estimates with Spitzer/IRAC, and because our computation assumes \( f_{\text{esc, quasar}} = 100 \% \), while Cristiani et al. (2016) uses \( f_{\text{esc, quasar}} \approx 70 \% \).

Furthermore, our results are also consistent with observations from Chen et al. (2007) who find a mean escape fraction of 2±2% averaged over galaxy viewing angles using spectroscopy of the afterglow of a sample of \( \gamma \)-Ray bursts at \( z > 2 \). Grazian et al. (2016) measures a strict median upper limit of \( \langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle < 2 \% \) at \( z = 3.3 \), although this limit is for relatively luminous Lyman-break galaxies and not for the entire population of SFGs. This would potentially indicate that the majority of LyC photons escape from galaxies with lower luminosity, or galaxies missed by a Lyman-break selection, i.e. Cooke et al. (2014) or that they come from just a sub-set of the population, and thus the median \( f_{\text{esc}} \) can even be close to zero. Khaire et al. (2016) finds that \( f_{\text{esc}} \) must evolve from \( \approx 5 - 20 \% \) between \( z = 3 - 5 \), which is allowed within the errors. However, we note that they assume that the number of produced ionizing photons per unit UV luminosity does not evolve with redshift. In §6.5 we find that there is evolution of this number by roughly a factor 1.5, such that the required evolution of \( f_{\text{esc}} \) would only be a factor \( \approx 3 \). While our results indicate little to no evolution in the average escape fraction up to \( z \approx 5 \), this does not rule out an increasing \( f_{\text{esc}} \) at \( z > 5 \), where theoretical models expect an evolving \( f_{\text{esc}} \) (e.g. Kuhlen & Faucher-Giguère 2012; Ferrara & Loeb 2013; Mitra et al. 2013; Khaire et al. 2016; Sharma

\textbf{Figure 4.} Evolution of the globally averaged \( \langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle \), which is obtained by forcing the emissivity of the integrated H\( \alpha \) (\( z = 2.2 \)) and UV (\( z \approx 4 - 5 \)) LF to be equal to the emissivity measured by IGM absorption models from Becker & Bolton 2013. The \( z \approx 4 - 5 \) results are based on a UV luminosity function which is then corrected to a SFR function with Ho measurements from Spitzer/IRAC, which implicitly means using a value of \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) (SFR functions are presented in Smit et al. 2015, but see also Bouwens et al. 2016). The error bars of red and blue symbols include estimates of the systematic uncertainties. The green diamond shows the estimated value by Cristiani et al. 2016, who combined IGM constraints with a UV LBG and the emissivity of QSOs at \( z = 3.6 - 4.0 \).
et al. 2016; Price et al. 2016), see also a recent observational claim of evolving $f_{\text{esc}}$ with redshift (Smith et al. 2016).

Finally, we stress that a low $f_{\text{esc}}$ is not inconsistent with the recent detection of the high $f_{\text{esc}}$ of above 50% from a galaxy at $z \approx 3$ (De Barros et al. 2016; Vanzella et al. 2016), which may simply reflect that there is a broad distribution of escape fractions. For example, if only a small fraction (<5%) of galaxies are LyC leakers with $f_{\text{esc}} \approx 75\%$, the average $f_{\text{esc}}$ over the galaxy population is $\approx 4\%$, consistent with the indirect measurement, even if $f_{\text{esc}} = 0$ for all other galaxies. Such a scenario would be the case if the escape of LyC photons is a very stochastic process, for example if it is highly direction or time dependent. This can be tested with deeper LyC limits on individual galaxies over a complete selection of star-forming galaxies.

Figure 5. Histogram of the values of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ for HAEs with three different methods to correct for dust attenuation. The blue histogram shows values of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ when dust is corrected with the $E(B-V)$ value from the SED in combination with a Calzetti law (see §2.1). The red histogram is corrected for dust with the Meurer et al. 1999 prescription based on the UV slope and the law (see §2.1). The green histogram is corrected for dust with the prescription from Garn & Best 2010 based on a relation between dust attenuation and stellar mass. As can be seen, the measured values of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ differ significantly, with the highest values found when correcting for dust with the UV slope. When the nebular attenuation is higher than the stellar attenuation, $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ would shift to higher values.

6 THE IONIZING PROPERTIES OF STAR-FORMING GALAXIES AT $z = 2.2$

6.1 How to measure $\xi_{\text{ion}}$?

The number of ionizing photons produced per unit UV luminosity, $\xi_{\text{ion}}$, is used to convert the observed UV luminosity of high-redshift galaxies to the number of produced ionizing photons. It can thus be interpreted as the production efficiency of ionizing photons. $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ is defined as:

$$\xi_{\text{ion}} = Q_{\text{ion}} / L_{\text{UV, int}}$$

(7)

As described in the previous section, $Q_{\text{ion}}$ (in $s^{-1}$) can be measured directly from the dust-corrected Hα luminosity by rewriting Eq. 2 and assuming $f_{\text{esc}} = 0$. $L_{\text{UV, int}}$ (in erg s$^{-1}$ Hz$^{-1}$) is obtained by correcting the observed UV magnitudes for dust attenuation. With a Calzetti et al. (2000) attenuation curve $A_{\text{UV}} = 3.1A_{\text{Hα}}$.

In our definition of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$, we assume that the escape fraction of ionizing photons is 0. Our strict constraint of $f_{\text{esc}} \lesssim 6\%$ and our indirect global measurement of $f_{\text{esc}} \approx 5\%$ validate this assumption. If the average escape fraction is $f_{\text{esc}} = 10\%$, $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ is higher by a factor 1.11 (so only 0.04 dex), such that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ is relatively insensitive to the escape fraction as long as the escape fraction is low. We also note that the $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ measurements at $z \approx 4 - 5$ from Bouwens et al. (2016) are validated by our finding that the global escape fraction at $z < 5$ is consistent with being very low, < 5%.

6.2 $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ at $z = 2.2$

We show our measured values of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ for HAEs in Fig. 5 and Table 3, where dust attenuation is corrected with three different methods based either on the $E(B-V)$ value of the SED fit, the UV slope or the stellar mass. It can be seen that the average value of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ is very sensitive to the dust correction method, ranging from $\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{24.39 \pm 0.04}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$ for the SED method to $\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{25.11 \pm 0.04}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$ for the $\beta$ method. For the dust correction based on stellar mass the value lies in between, with $\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{24.85 \pm 0.04}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$. In the case of a higher nebular attenuation than the stellar attenuation, as for example by a factor $\approx 2$ as in the original Calzetti et al. (2000) prescription, $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ increases by 0.4 dex to $\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{24.79 \pm 0.04}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$ when correcting for dust with the SED fit.

Table 3. Ionizing properties of HAEs and LAEs for various methods to correct for dust attenuations and different subsets. We show the median stellar mass of each subsample. Errors on $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ are computed as $\sigma_{\xi_{\text{ion}}} / \sqrt{N}$, where $\sigma_{\xi_{\text{ion}}}$ is the median measurement error of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and $N$ the number of sources. For the Bouwens et al. (2016) measurements, we show only dust corrections with a Calzetti et al. (2000) curve. The subsample of ‘low mass’ HAEs has $M_{\text{star}} = 10^{9.0 - 9.4}$ $\text{M}_\odot$. UV faint’ HAEs have $M_{1500} > -19$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$&lt;M_{\text{star}}&gt;$</th>
<th>$\log_{10} \xi_{\text{ion}}$</th>
<th>Dust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAEs $z = 2.2$</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>$24.39 \pm 0.04$ E(B - V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.11 \pm 0.04$ $\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24.77 \pm 0.04$ $M_{\text{star}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.41 \pm 0.05$ No dust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24.57 \pm 0.04$ $A_{\text{Hα}} = 1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low mass</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>$24.49 \pm 0.06$ E(B - V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.22 \pm 0.06$ $\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24.99 \pm 0.06$ $M_{\text{star}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV faint</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>$24.93 \pm 0.07$ E(B - V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.39 \pm 0.07$ $\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.24 \pm 0.07$ $M_{\text{star}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAEs $z = 2.2$</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>$24.84 \pm 0.09$ E(B - V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.37 \pm 0.09$ $\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.14 \pm 0.09$ $M_{\text{star}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.39 \pm 0.09$ No dust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouwens et al. (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBGs $z = 3.8 - 5.0$</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>$25.27 \pm 0.03$ $\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBGs $z = 5.1 - 5.4$</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>$25.44 \pm 0.12$ $\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We note that independent (stacking) measurements of the dust attenuation from Herschel and Balmer decrements at $z \approx 1 - 2$ indicate that dust attenuations agree very well with the Garn & Best (2010) prescription (e.g. Sobral et al. 2012; Ibar et al. 2013; Buat et al. 2015; Pannella et al. 2015), thus favouring the intermediate value of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$. Without correcting $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ for dust, we find $\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{25.41\pm0.05}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$. With 1 magnitude of extinction for Hα, as for example used in the conversion of the Hα luminosity density to a SFR density in Sobral et al. (2013), $\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{24.57\pm0.04}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$.

Since individual Hα measurements for LAEs are uncertain due to the difference in filter transmissions depending on the exact redshift (see Matthee et al. 2016), we only investigate $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ for our sample of LAEs in the stacks described in Sobral et al. (2016a). With stacking, we measure the median Hα flux of LAEs convolved through the filter profile and the median UV luminosity by stacking V band imaging. As seen in Table 3, the median $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ is higher than the median $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ for HAEs for each dust correction. However, this difference disappears without correcting for dust. Therefore, the higher values of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ for LAEs simply indicate that the median LAE has a bluer UV slope, lower stellar mass and lower $E(B-V)$ than the median HAE. More accurate dust measurements are required to investigate whether $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ is really higher for LAEs. We note that $\approx 40\%$ of the LAEs are undetected in the broad-bands and thus assigned a stellar mass of $10^8 M_\odot$ and $E(B-V) = 0.1$ when computing the median dust attenuation. Therefore, the $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ values for LAEs could be under-estimated if the real dust attenuation is even lower.

### 6.3 Dependence on galaxy properties

In this section we investigate how $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ depends on the galaxy properties that are defined in §2.1 and also check whether subsets of galaxies lie in a specific parameter space. As illustrated in Fig. 6 (where we correct for dust with $E(B-V)$), we find that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ does not depend strongly on SFR(Hα) with a Spearman correlation rank ($R_s$) of $R_s = 0.11$. Such a correlation would naively be expected if the Hα SFRs are not related closely to UV SFRs, since $\xi_{\text{ion}} \propto L_{\text{Hα}}/L_{1500} \propto$ SFR(Hα)/SFR(UV). However, for our sample of galaxies these SFRs are strongly correlated with only 0.3 dex of scatter, see also Oteo et al. (2015), leading to a relatively constant $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ with SFR.

For the same reason, we measure a relatively weak slope of $\approx 0.25$ when we fit a simple linear relation between log_{10}(\xi_{\text{ion}}) and $M_{1500}$, instead of the naively expected value of $\xi_{\text{ion}} \propto 0.4M_{1500}$. At $M_{1500} > -20$, our Hα selection is biased towards high values of Hα relative to the UV, leading to a bias in high values of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$. For sources with $M_{1500} < -20$, we measure a slope of $\approx 0.2$. This means that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ does not increase rapidly with decreasing UV luminosity. This is because Hα luminosity and dust attenuation themselves are also related to $M_{1500}$. Indeed, we find that the Hα luminosity anti-correlates with the UV magnitude and $E(B-V)$ increases for fainter UV magnitudes.

The stellar mass and $\beta$ are not by definition directly related to $\xi_{\text{ion}}$. Therefore, a possible upturn of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ at low masses (see the middle-top panel in Fig. 6) may be a real
We find that the number of ionizing photons per unit UV luminosity is strongly related to the Hα EW (with a slope of $\sim$ 0.6 in log-log space), see Fig. 6. Such a correlation is expected because of our definition of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$: i) the Hα EW increases mildly with increasing Hα (line-)luminosity and ii) the Hα EW is weakly anti-related with the UV (continuum) luminosity, such that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ increases relatively strongly with EW. Since there is a relation between Hα EW and specific SFR ($s\text{SFR} = \text{SFR}/M_{\star}$, e.g. Fumagalli et al. 2012), we also find that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ increases strongly with increasing $s\text{SFR}$, see Fig. 6.

In Fig. 7 we show the same correlations as discussed above, but now compare the results for different methods to correct for dust. For comparison, we only show the median $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ in bins of the property on the x-axis. The vertical error on the bins is the standard deviation of the values of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ in the bin. As $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ depends on the dust correction, we find that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ correlates with the galaxy property that was used to correct for dust in the case of $\beta$ (red symbols) and $M_{\star}$ (green symbols). Specific SFR depends on stellar mass, so we also find the strongest correlation between $s\text{SFR}$ and $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ when $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ is corrected for dust with the Garn & Best (2010) prescription. We only find a relation between $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and $\beta$ when dust is corrected with the Meurer et al. (1999) prescription. For UV magnitude only the normalisation of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ changes with the dust correction method.

It is more interesting to look at correlations between $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and galaxy properties which are not directly related to the computation of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ or the dust correction. Hence, we note that irrespective of the dust correction method, $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ appears to be somewhat higher for lower mass galaxies (although this is likely a selection effect as discussed above). Irrespective of the dust correction method, $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ increases with increasing Hα EW and fainter $M_{1500}$, where the particular dust correction method used only sets the normalisation. We return to this relation between $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and Hα EW in §6.5.

6.4 Redshift evolution of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$

Because of its dependency on galaxy properties, it is possible that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ evolves with redshift. In fact, such an evolution is expected as more evolved galaxies (particularly with declining star formation histories) have a relatively stronger UV luminosity than Hα and a higher dust content, likely leading to a lower $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ at $z > 2$ than at $z > 6$.

By comparing our measurement of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ with those from Bouwens et al. (2016) at $z = 4 - 5$, we already find such an evolution (see Table 3), although we note that the samples of galaxies are selected differently and that there are many other differences, such as the dust attenuation, typical stellar mass and the Hα measurement. If we mimic a Lyman-break selected sample by only selecting HAEs with $E(B-V) < 0.3$.
LyC photon production and escape from SFGs at $z \sim 2$

We estimate the redshift evolution of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ by combining the relation between $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and Hα EW with the redshift evolution of the Hα EW. Several studies have recently noted that the Hα EW (and related sSFR) increases with increasing redshift (e.g. Fumagalli et al. 2012; Sobral et al. 2014; Smit et al. 2014; Mármore-Queraltó et al. 2016; Faisst et al. 2016; Khostovan et al. 2016). Furthermore, the EW is mildly dependent on stellar mass as $\text{EW} \sim M_{\text{star}}^{-0.25}$ (Sobral et al. 2014; Mármore-Queraltó et al. 2016). In order to estimate the $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ using the Hα EW evolution, we:

i) Select a subset of our HAEs with stellar mass between $10^8 - 9.4 \, M_{\odot}$, with a median of $M_{\text{star}} \approx 10^9.2 \, M_{\odot}$, which is similar to the mass of the sample from Bouwens et al. (2016), see Smit et al. (2015).

ii) Fit a linear trend between $\log_{10} (\text{EW})$ and $\log_{10} (\xi_{\text{ion}})$ (with the Garn & Best (2010) prescription to correct for dust attenuation). We note that the trend between EW and $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ will be steepened if dust is corrected with a prescription based on stellar mass (since Hα EW anti-correlates with stellar mass, see also Table 4). However, this is validated by several independent observations from either Herschel or Balmer decrements which confirm that dust attenuation increases with stellar mass at a wide range of redshifts (Domínguez et al. 2013; Buat et al. 2015; Koyama et al. 2015; Pannella et al. 2015; Sobral et al. 2016).

Using a simple least squares algorithm, we find:

$$\log_{10} (\xi_{\text{ion}}) = 23.19^{+0.09}_{-0.09} + 0.77^{+0.04}_{-0.04} \times \log_{10} (\text{EW}) \quad (8)$$

iii) Combine the trend between Hα EW and redshift with the trend between $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and Hα EW. We use the redshift evolution of the Hα EW from Faisst et al. (2016), which has been inferred from fitting SEDs, and measured up to $z \approx 6$. In this parametrisation, the slope changes from $\text{EW} \approx (1 + z)^{1.87} \text{ at } z < 2.2$ to $\text{EW} \approx (1 + z)^{1.3} \text{ at } z > 2.2$. Below $z < 2.2$, this trend is fully consistent with the EW evolution...
from HiZELS (Sobral et al. 2014), which is measured with narrow-band imaging. Although HiZELS does not have Ha emitters at \(z > 2.2\), the EW evolution of [Oii]+H\(\beta\) is found to flatten at \(z > 2.2\) as well (Khostovan et al. 2016). We note that we assume that the slope of the Ha EW evolution with redshift does not vary strongly for stellar masses between \(10^9.2 \, M_\odot\) and \(10^9.8 \, M_\odot\), since the following equations are measured at stellar mass \(\approx 10^9.6 \, M_\odot\) (Faisst et al. 2016), hence:

\[
\text{EW}(z) = \begin{cases} 
20 \times (1 + z)^{1.87}, & z < 2.2 \\
37.4 \times (1 + z)^{-1.3}, & z \geq 2.2 
\end{cases}
\]

This results in:

\[
\log_{10}(\xi_{\text{ion}}(z)) = \begin{cases} 
24.19 + 1.44 \times \log_{10}(1 + z), & z < 2.2 \\
24.40 + 1.00 \times \log_{10}(1 + z), & z \geq 2.2 
\end{cases}
\]

where \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) is in Hz erg\(^{-1}\). The error on the normalisation is 0.09 Hz erg\(^{-1}\) and the error on the slope is 0.18. For our typical mass of \(M_{\text{star}} = 10^9.8 \, M_\odot\), the normalisation is roughly 0.2 dex lower and the slope a factor \(\approx 1.1\) higher compared to the fit at lower stellar masses. This is due to a slightly different relation between \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) and EW (see Table 4). The evolving \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) is consistent with the typically assumed value of \(\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{25.2 \pm 0.1}\) Hz erg\(^{-1}\) (e.g. Robertson et al. 2013) at \(z \approx 2.5 - 12\) within the \(1\)σ error bars.

We show the inferred evolution of \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) with redshift in Fig. 8. The solid and dashed line use the EW(z) evolution from Faisst et al. (2016), while the dotted line uses the Khostovan et al. (2016) parametrisation. The grey shaded region indicates the errors on the redshift evolution of \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\). Due to the anti-correlation between EW and stellar mass, galaxies with a lower stellar mass have a higher \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) (which is then even strengthened by a higher dust attenuation at high masses).

Relatively independent of the dust correction (as discussed in Fig. B1), the median \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) increases \(\approx 0.2\) dex at fixed stellar mass between \(z = 2.2\) and \(z = 4.5\). This can easily explain the 0.2 dex difference between our measurement at \(z = 2.2\) and the Bouwens et al. (2016) measurements at \(z = 4 - 5\) (see Fig. 8), such that it is plausible that \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) evolves to higher values in the reionization epoch, of roughly \(\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{25.4}\) Hz erg\(^{-1}\) at \(z \approx 8\). Interestingly, LAEs at \(z = 2.2\) already have \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) similar to the canonical value in the reionization era.

### 7 IMPLICATIONS FOR REIONIZATION

The product of \(f_{\text{esc}}\xi_{\text{ion}}\) is an important parameter in assessing whether galaxies have provided the photons to reionize the Universe, because these convert the (non-ionizing) UV luminosity density (obtained from integrating the dust-corrected UV luminosity function) to the ionizing emissivity. The typical adopted values are \(\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{25.2 - 25.5}\) Hz erg\(^{-1}\) and \(f_{\text{esc}} \approx 0.1 - 0.2\) (e.g. Robertson et al. 2015), such that the product is \(f_{\text{esc}}\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{24.2 - 24.6}\) Hz erg\(^{-1}\). This is significantly higher than our upper limit of \(f_{\text{esc}}\xi_{\text{ion}} \lessapprox 10^{23.5}\) Hz erg\(^{-1}\) (using \(f_{\text{esc}}\) and \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) where dust is corrected with \(M_{\text{star}}\), see §5 and §6). However, as shown in §6.5, we expect \(\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{25.4}\) Hz erg\(^{-1}\) in the reionization era due to the dependency of \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) on EW(Ha), such that escape fractions of \(f_{\text{esc}} \approx 7\%\) would suffice for \(f_{\text{esc}}\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{24.2}\) Hz erg\(^{-1}\). Becker & Bolton (2013) find an evolution in the product of \(f_{\text{esc}}\xi_{\text{ion}}\) of a factor 4 between \(z = 3 - 5\) (similar to Haardt & Madau 2012), which is consistent with our measurements.

Recently, Faisst (2016) inferred that \(f_{\text{esc}}\) may evolve with redshift by combining a relation between \(f_{\text{esc}}\) and the [Oii]/[Oii] ratio with the inferred redshift evolution of the [Oii]/[Oii] ratio. This redshift evolution is estimated from local analogs to high redshift galaxies selected on Ha EW, such that the redshift evolution of \(f_{\text{esc}}\) is implicitly coupled to the evolution of Ha EW as in our model of \(\xi_{\text{ion}}(z)\). Faisst (2016) estimate that \(f_{\text{esc}}\) evolves from \(\approx 2\%\) at \(z = 2\) to \(\approx 5\%\) at \(z = 5\), which is consistent with our measurements of \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) (see Fig. 4). With this evolving escape fraction, galaxies can provide sufficient amounts of photons to reionize the Universe, consistent with the most recent CMB constraints (Planck Collaboration et al. 2016). This calculation assumes \(\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{25.4}\) Hz erg\(^{-1}\), which is the same value our model predicts for \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) in the reionization era.

In addition to understanding whether galaxies have reionized the Universe, it is perhaps more interesting to understand which galaxies have been the most important to do so. For example, Sharma et al. (2016) argue that the distribution of escape fractions in galaxies is likely very bimodal and dependent on the SFR surface density, which could mean that LyC photons preferentially escape from bright galaxies. Such a scenario may agree better with a late and rapid reionization process such as favoured by the low new optical depth measurement from Planck Collaboration et al. (2016). We note that the apparent discrepancy between the \(f_{\text{esc}}\) upper limit from median stacking (\(f_{\text{esc}} \leq 2.8\%\)) and the average \(f_{\text{esc}}\) from the integrated luminosity density combined with IGM constraints (\(f_{\text{esc}} \approx 5.9\%\)) can be understood in a scenario where the average \(f_{\text{esc}}\) is driven by a few galaxies with high \(f_{\text{esc}}\) or by a scenario where \(f_{\text{esc}}\) is higher for galaxies below the Ha detection threshold (which corresponds to SFR > \(4 \, M_\odot\, \text{yr}^{-1}\)), contrarily to a scenario where each typical HAE has an escape fraction of \(\approx 5 - 6\%\).

Dijkstra et al. (2016) argue a connection between the escape of Lyo photons and LyC photons, such that LAEs could potentially be important contributors to the photon budget in the reionization era (particularly since we find that \(\xi_{\text{ion}}\) is higher for LAEs than for more normal star-forming galaxies at \(z = 2.2\)). Hence, LAEs may have been important contributors of the photons that reionized the Universe.

To make progress we need a detailed understanding of
the physical processes which drive $f_{\text{esc}}$, for which a significant sample of directly detected LyC leakers at a range of redshifts and galaxy properties is required. It is challenging to measure $f_{\text{esc}}$ directly at $z > 3$ (and practically impossible at $z > 5$) due to the increasing optical depth of the IGM with redshift, such that indirect methods to estimate $f_{\text{esc}}$ may be more successful (e.g. Jones et al. 2013; Zackrisson et al. 2013; Verhamme et al. 2015). However, the validity of these methods remains to be evaluated (i.e. Vasei et al. 2016).

8 CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the production and escape of ionizing photons (LyC, $\lambda_0 < 912$ Å) for a large sample of Hα selected galaxies at $z = 2.2$. Thanks to the joint coverage of the rest-frame LyC, UV and Hα (and, in some cases, Lyα), we have been able to reliably estimate the intrinsic LyC luminosity and the number of ionizing photons per unit UV luminosity ($\xi_{\text{ion}}$), for which we (indirectly) constrained the escape fraction of ionizing photons ($f_{\text{esc}}$). Our results are:

(i) We have stacked the NUV thumbnails for all HAEs and subsets of galaxies in order to obtain constraints on $f_{\text{esc}}$. None of the stacks shows a direct detection of LyC flux, allowing us to place a median (mean) upper limit of $f_{\text{esc}} < 2.8 (6.4) \%$ for the stack of star-forming HAEs ($\S 4.3$). A low escape fraction validates our method to estimate $\xi_{\text{ion}}$, the production efficiency of ionizing photons.

(ii) Combining the IGM emissivity measurements from Becker & Bolton (2013) with the integrated Hα luminosity function from Sobral et al. (2013) at $z = 2.2$, we find a globally averaged $\langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle = 5.9_{-4.2}^{+14.3} \%$ at $z = 2.2$ ($\S 5$), where the errors include conservative estimates of the systematic uncertainties. Combined with recent estimates of the QSO emissivity at $z \approx 2.2$, we can not fully rule out a non-zero contribution from star-forming galaxies to the ionizing emissivity. We speculate that the apparent discrepancy between the Fesc upper limit from median stacking and $\langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle$ can be understood in a scenario where the average $f_{\text{esc}}$ is driven by a few galaxies with high $f_{\text{esc}}$, or by a scenario where $f_{\text{esc}}$ is higher for galaxies below the Hα detection threshold (SFR > 4 $M_\odot$ yr$^{-1}$).

(iii) Applying a similar analysis to published data at $z \approx 4 – 5$ results in a relatively constant $f_{\text{esc}}$ with redshift (see Table 2 and Fig. 4). We rule out $\langle f_{\text{esc}} \rangle > 20 \%$ at redshifts lower than $z \approx 5$. An additional contribution of ionizing photons from rare quasars strengthens this constraint.

(iv) We find that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ increases strongly with increasing sSFR and Hα EW and decreasing UV luminosity, independently on the dust correction method. We find no significant correlations between $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and SFR(Hα), $\beta$ or $M_{\text{star}}$. On average, LAEs have a higher $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ than HAEs, a consequence of LAEs having typically bluer UV slopes, lower masses and lower values of $E(B-V)$ ($\S 6$) – properties which are typical for galaxies at the highest redshift.

(v) The median $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ of HAEs at $z = 2.2$ is $\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{23.77 \pm 0.04}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$, which is $\approx 0.4$ dex lower than the typically assumed values in the reionization era or recent measurements at $z \sim 4 – 5$ (Bouwens et al. 2016), see Table 3. Only half of this difference is explained by the lower stellar mass and dust attenuation of the galaxies in the Bouwens et al. (2016) sample.

(vi) For LAEs at $z = 2.2$ we find a higher $\xi_{\text{ion}} = 10^{23.14 \pm 0.09}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$, already similar to the typical value assumed in the reionization era. This difference is driven by the fact that LAEs are typically less massive and bluer and thus have less dust than HAEs.

(vii) By combining our trend between $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and Hα EW with the redshift evolution of Hα EW, we find that $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ increases with $\approx 0.2$ dex between $z = 2.2$ and $z = 4 – 5$, resulting in perfect agreement with the results from Bouwens et al. (2016). Extrapolating this trend leads to a median value of $\xi_{\text{ion}} \approx 10^{25.4}$ Hz erg$^{-1}$ at $z \sim 8$, slightly higher than the typically assumed value in the reionization epoch ($\S 7$), such that a relatively low global $f_{\text{esc}}$ (consistent with our global estimates at $z \approx 2 – 5$) would suffice to provide the photons to reionize the Universe.
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APPENDIX A: INDIVIDUAL NUV DETECTIONS

We search for individual galaxies possibly leaking LyC photons by matching our CLEAN galaxy sample with the public GALEX EM cleaned catalogue (e.g. Zamojski et al. 2007; Conseil et al. 2011), which is $U$ band detected. In total, we find 19 matches between CLEAN HAEs and GALEX sources with $NUV < 26$ within 1″ (33 matches when using all HAEs), and 9 matches between LAEs and GALEX sources (four out of these 9 are also in the HAE sample and we will discuss these as HAEs). By visual inspection of the HST/ACS F814W and CFHT/U band imaging, we mark 8/19 HAEs and 2/5 LAEs as reliable NUV detections. The 14 matches that we discarded were either unreliable detections in NUV (9 times, caused by local variations in the depth, such that the detections are at 2σ level) or a fake source in NUV (5 times, caused by artefacts of bright objects). We note however that in most of the remaining 10 NUV detections (8 HAEs, 2 LAEs) the NUV photometry is blended with a source at a distance of ∼4″, see Fig. A1.

In order to get a first order estimate of the contamination from neighbouring sources to the NUV flux, we perform the following simulation. First, we simulate the NUV flux of the candidate LyC leakers and all sources within 10″ by placing Moffat flux distributions with the PSF-FWHM of NUV imaging and $β = 3$. These flux distributions are normalised by the $U$ band magnitude of each source, since the catalog that we use to measure NUV imaging uses $U$ band imaging as a prior. We then measure the fraction of the flux that is coming from neighbouring sources within an aperture with radius 0.67×FWHM centred at the position of the NUV detection of the candidate LyC leaker. We find that contamination for most candidates is significant, and remove three candidates for which the estimated contamination is larger than > 50 %. The remaining candidates have contaminations ranging from 0-39 % and we subtract this contamination from the measured NUV flux when estimating their escape fractions. We estimate the uncertainty in our contamination estimate due to variations in the PSF and in the flux normalisation (due to $NUV - U$ colours) as follows: we first simulate the contamination with a gaussian PSF and Moffat PSFs with increasing $β$ up to $β = 7$ and also by correcting the $U$ band magnitude prior with the observed $U - B$ and $NUV - U$ colours. We then estimate the systematic uncertainty by measuring the standard deviation of the contamination rates estimated with the different simulations. For sources with little contamination, the systematic uncertainty in the contamination estimate is of the order 5 %.

We test whether the NUV detections for these sources could arise solely from flux at $λ_0 > 912$ Å in the far red wing of the NUV filter (see §3.2). For each galaxy, we obtain the best-fit STARLIGHT99 model by matching the Ho EW, as Ho EW is most strongly related to the SED shape around 900 Å. We redshift this model to a redshift of 2.22 and normalise the SED to reproduce the $V$ band magnitude (we assume zero dust attenuation, which is a conservative assumption for this analysis, see below) and convolve the model with the mean IGM transmission at $z = 2.22$. Then, we measure the predicted NUV magnitude in the case that the flux is only non-zero at $λ_0 > 912$ Å. We find that, in all cases, this magnitude is too faint to explain the NUV detections, ranging from $NUV = 30.1 - 32.5$, well below the detection limits. In the presence of dust, the attenuation at $λ \sim 912 - 930$ Å is stronger than at $λ = 912$ Å. We find that, in all cases, this magnitude is too faint to explain the NUV detections, ranging from $NUV = 30.1 - 32.5$, well below the detection limits. In the presence of dust, the attenuation at $λ \sim 912 - 930$ Å is stronger than at $λ = 912$ Å.
\( z = 2.20 - 2.24 \), but find that this changes the result only by up to 1 magnitude if all effects are combined. For ID 1139 and 7801 we also test simple AGN power-law models (\( I_\lambda \propto \lambda^{\beta} \)) with UV slopes ranging from -2.0 to -2.7, but find that pure non-ionizing flux can not explain the NUV photometry. Therefore, it is unlikely that the NUV detections arise purely from flux at \( \lambda_0 > 912 \) Å, just because the filter transmission at these wavelengths is very low, and the wavelength range constitutes only a fraction of the full filter width.

For the five candidate LyC leakers with H\( \alpha \) measurements, we measure escape fractions ranging from \( \approx 35 - 46 \) \%, see Table. A1, although we note that these escape fractions are still uncertain due to i) possible underestimated foreground contamination from sources not detected in \( U \) (or not detected as individual source due to blending) or with very blue NUV – \( U \) colours, ii) uncertain dust attenuation of the H\( \alpha \) luminosity, iii) underestimated contribution from flux at \( \lambda_0 > 912 \) Å due to different SED shapes than expected or (photometric) redshift errors. Observations with higher spatial resolution and detailed spectroscopy are required in order to confirm whether these 7 candidates are really leaking LyC photons and at what rate.

Four isolated LyC leaker candidates (including two LAEs) are X-Ray AGN, and all have been spectroscopically confirmed at \( z = 2.2 \) (Lilly et al. 2009; Civano et al. 2012). HiZELS-ID 1993 is detected in two other narrow-bands than the H\( \alpha \) narrow-band: Ly\( \alpha \) (\( EW_{\text{Ly}\alpha} = 67 \) Å) and [Oiii] (\( EW_{\text{[OIII]}}, EW_{\text{[OIII]}} > 100 \) Å), and is thus known to be at \( z = 2.22 \pm 0.01 \) very robustly. ID 1872 and 2258 are selected as HAE at \( z = 2.2 \) based on their photometry (see Sobral et al. 2013), such that it is possible that they are interlopers (with the second most likely emission-line being [Oiii] at \( z \sim 3.3 \), but other rarer possibilities such as Paschen series lines at \( z < 1 \)). We show thumbnail images of our candidate LyC leakers in the NUV, F814W and \( U \) bands in Fig. A1 and Fig. A2.

APPENDIX B: REDSHIFT EVOLUTION OF \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) WITH DIFFERENT DUST CORRECTIONS

In Fig. B1 we show the inferred redshift evolution of \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) when we apply different methods to correct \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) for dust. Most of the differences are caused by a varying normalisation of \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \), since we find that the slope of the fit between \( \xi_{\text{ion}} \) and H\( \alpha \) EW varies only mildly for various dust correction methods, see Table 4. However, we note again that most independent (stacking) observations from Balmer decrements and Herschel prefer dust attenuations similar to the dust attenuation we use when correcting for dust with stellar mass.
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Table A1. Candidate LyC leakers among the HAE/LAE sample. ID numbers of HAEs refer to the IDs in the HiZELS catalog (Sobral et al. 2013). IDs indicated with a * are X-Ray AGN. The coordinates correspond to the peak of Hα/Lyα emission. The redshift is either spectroscopic (*), photometric (p) or from a dual-narrow band emission-line confirmation (d). The NUV contamination fraction is estimated as described in the text. f_\text{esc} is corrected for contamination from nearby sources to the NUV flux. Because of the absence of Hα measurements for LAEs, we do not estimate the SFR(Hα) or f_\text{esc}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>R.A. (J2000)</th>
<th>Dec. (J2000)</th>
<th>Redshift</th>
<th>M_{star} \log_{10}(M_{\odot})</th>
<th>SFR(H\alpha) \ M_{\odot} \ yr^{-1}</th>
<th>M_{1500} \ mag</th>
<th>NUV \ mag</th>
<th>NUV contamination</th>
<th>f_\text{esc}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1139*</td>
<td>10:00:55.39</td>
<td>+01:59:55.39</td>
<td>2.219^*</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>-21.6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>10:01:56.39</td>
<td>+02:17:36.65</td>
<td>2.22±0.02^p</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-21.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>10:02:08.70</td>
<td>+02:21:19.88</td>
<td>2.22±0.01^d</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-21.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>10:01:29.69</td>
<td>+02:24:28.50</td>
<td>2.22±0.02^p</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-21.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7801*</td>
<td>10:02:08.55</td>
<td>+01:45:33.60</td>
<td>2.215^*</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>-23.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8*</td>
<td>09:59:34.82</td>
<td>+02:02:49.94</td>
<td>2.182^a</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>-22.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10*</td>
<td>09:59:05.14</td>
<td>+02:15:29.86</td>
<td>2.222^a</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-23.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure A1. 15 × 15″ thumbnail images in NUV, F814W and U of candidate LyC leaking Hα and Lyα emitters at z = 2.2, centered on the positions of the HAE/LAE. The images are annotated with the IDs of the galaxies in the HiZELS catalogue (Sobral et al. 2013). Lyα emitters are identified with a “C”. IDs 1139, 1872 and 1993 are detected in both Hα and Lyα. IDs 1139, 7801, C-8 and C-10 are X-ray AGN. All other sources than the central source seen in thumbnails have photometric redshifts of < 1.5.
Figure A2. Continued from Fig. A1.
Figure B1. Inferred evolution of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ with redshift based on the EW(Hα) evolution from Faisst et al. (2016) and our observed trend between $\xi_{\text{ion}}$ and Hα EW for HAEs with $M_{\text{star}} \sim 10^{9.2}$ $M_\odot$, for different methods to correct for dust. The black line shows the results when correcting for dust with $M_{\text{star}}$, the red line shows dust corrected with $\beta$, the blue line shows dust corrected with the $E(B-V)$ values from SED fitting and the yellow line shows the results when we apply a global correction of $A_{H\alpha} = 1$. The shaded regions indicate the errors on the redshift evolution of $\xi_{\text{ion}}$. 