

On the Relation Between Symmetry of Radio Galaxies and Their Physical Parameters Post-print

Authors: Mohsen Javaherian, Halime Miraghaei and Hooman Moradpour

Date: 2024-10-08T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Gravity as a fundamental force plays a dominant role in the formation and evolution of cosmic objects and leaves its effect in the emergence of symmetric and asymmetric structures. Thus, analyzing the symmetry criteria allows us to uncover mechanisms behind the gravity interaction and understand the underlying physical processes that contribute to the formation of large-scale structures such as galaxies. We use a segmentation process using intensity thresholding and the k-means clustering algorithm to analyze radio galaxy images. We employ a symmetry criterion and explore the relation between morphological symmetry in radio maps and host galaxy properties. Optical properties (stellar mass, black hole mass, optical size (R50), concentration, stellar mass surface density (Σ), and stellar age) and radio properties (radio flux density, radio luminosity, and radio size) are considered. We found that there is a correlation between symmetry and radio size, indicating larger radio sources have smaller symmetry indices. Therefore, size of radio sources should be considered in any investigation of symmetry. Weak correlations are also observed with other properties, such as R50 for FRI galaxies and stellar age. We compare the symmetry differences between FRI and FR II radio galaxies. FR II galaxies show higher symmetry in 1.4 GHz and 150 MHz maps. Investigating the influence of radio source sizes, we discovered that this result is independent of the sizes of radio sources. These findings contribute to our understanding of the morphological properties and analyses of radio galaxies.

Full Text

Preamble

Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 24:095003 (23pp), 2024 September
© 2024. National Astronomical Observatories, CAS and IOP Publishing

Ltd. Printed in China and the U.K.
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/ad6c95>

On the Relation Between Symmetry of Radio Galaxies and Their Physical Parameters

Mohsen Javaherian, Halime Miraghaei, and Hooman Moradpour
Research Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics of Maragha (RIAAM),
University of Maragheh, P.O. Box 55136-553, Maragheh, Iran; javaherian@maragheh.ac.ir

Received 2024 March 6; revised 2024 July 20; accepted 2024 August 6; published 2024 August 28

Abstract

Gravity as a fundamental force plays a dominant role in the formation and evolution of cosmic objects and leaves its imprint on the emergence of symmetric and asymmetric structures. Thus, analyzing symmetry criteria allows us to uncover the mechanisms behind gravitational interactions and understand the underlying physical processes that contribute to the formation of large-scale structures such as galaxies. We employ a segmentation process using intensity thresholding and the k-means clustering algorithm to analyze radio galaxy images, utilizing a symmetry criterion to explore the relation between morphological symmetry in radio maps and host galaxy properties. Both optical properties (stellar mass, black hole mass, optical size (R50), concentration, stellar mass surface density (50), and stellar age) and radio properties (radio flux density, radio luminosity, and radio size) are considered. We find a correlation between symmetry and radio size, indicating that larger radio sources have smaller symmetry indices. Therefore, the size of radio sources should be considered in any investigation of symmetry. Weak correlations are also observed with other properties, such as R50 for FRI galaxies and stellar age.

We compare symmetry differences between FRI and FR II radio galaxies. FR II galaxies show higher symmetry in 1.4 GHz and 150 MHz maps. Investigating the influence of radio source sizes, we discovered that this result is independent of the sizes of radio sources. These findings contribute to our understanding of the morphological properties and analyses of radio galaxies.

Key words: methods: data analysis – techniques: image processing – catalogs – galaxies: nuclei – galaxies: distances and redshifts

1. Introduction

The significance of symmetry in large-scale structures and cosmic objects lies in its potential to reveal the intricate mechanisms of gravitational interactions. Exploring symmetry criteria enables us to uncover the underlying mechanisms governing gravity and comprehend the fundamental physical processes that con-

tribute to the creation of large-scale structures such as clusters and galaxies. For instance, spherical symmetry in a cluster of galaxies refers to the assumption that the distribution of matter within the cluster is symmetric around a central point, meaning that the cluster's properties, such as density or temperature, are the same in all directions from the center. Spherical symmetry is particularly useful in the analysis of X-ray observations of galaxy clusters, where the emission from the hot intracluster gas is assumed to be spherically symmetric (e.g., see Sarazin 1988; Vikhlinin et al. 2006; Kravtsov & Borgani 2012). Indeed, investigating the symmetry and asymmetry of diverse phenomena and their respective definitions aids in comprehending the distinctions and resemblances among different objects (Hajdukovic 2010; Mazharimousavi et al. 2010; Kornreich et al. 1998). For instance, Mazharimousavi et al. (1998) and Kornreich et al. (2010) provide examples of symmetry definitions for distinct phenomena in symmetrical black holes and the assessment of photometric methodology for quantifying asymmetries in disk galaxies, respectively. Depending on the nature of the phenomenon, each requires a unique approach, whether through theoretical methods or observational techniques, to define symmetry.

Galaxies often exhibit different degrees of symmetry, ranging from highly symmetric spiral galaxies to more irregular and asymmetric galaxies. The level of symmetry in a galaxy can be influenced by various factors, such as the initial conditions of formation, interactions with neighboring galaxies, and the effects of gravitational forces (Mo et al. 2010). Symmetry in galaxies can reveal valuable information about their formation history and the physical processes at work (Sparke & Gallagher 2007). For example, spiral galaxies with well-defined arms and symmetrical structures are often associated with more orderly and stable formation processes (Stahler & Palla 2004). On the other hand, irregular and asymmetric galaxies may have experienced disruptive events such as mergers or interactions with other galaxies (Schweizer et al. 1997).

In radio passbands, symmetry also plays a crucial role in understanding the formation of radio galaxies. Symmetry in radio galaxies refers to the arrangement and distribution of their structures and features. The morphology and symmetry of these galaxies provide significant clues about their formation and evolution processes. Their symmetries and morphologies as large-scale structures can reveal insights into the underlying physical processes driving galaxy formation, such as gravitational interactions, gas dynamics, and the role of dark matter (Chibueze et al. 2021; de Gasperin et al. 2022). Moreover, focusing on nonthermal and polarized emissions of radio galaxies offers a unique perspective on active galactic nuclei (AGNs) and their evolution (Hardcastle & Croston 2020). By analyzing their various properties—continuum spectrum, spectral index, morphology, and correlations with AGN properties at different frequencies—we can discover the intricate interplay between AGNs and their surrounding medium (Bîrzan et al. 2008). These investigations span a wide range of measurements, from very-long-baseline interferometry (VLBI) observations at parsec scales to deep observations of the larger-scale environment at megaparsecs. These studies provide valuable information about physical pro-

cesses occurring around supermassive black holes (Heckman & Best 2014; Yuan & Narayan 2014).

Among a set of papers that have investigated symmetry and asymmetry in radio structures (Saikia et al. 1984; Cornwell et al. 1986; Rys 1994; Best et al. 1997; Gopal-Krishna 2000; Mantovani et al. 2003; Saikia et al. 2003; Hardcastle et al. 2005; Sarzi et al. 2006), the reader can explore how the presence of symmetry or asymmetry in the distribution of radio emission associated with a radio galaxy can indicate different formation scenarios. Symmetric radio galaxies may suggest a relatively undisturbed and stable environment during their formation, while asymmetric galaxies may imply interactions, mergers, or other dynamic processes that have disrupted their morphology (Morganti et al. 2003; Sarzi et al. 2006; Pérez-Torres & De Breuck 2005; Tadhunter 2007; Hocuk & Barthel 2010). We define symmetry criteria based on various parameters, such as proximity to the center, eccentricity, orientation, and appearance in different image quarters. Through an examination of symmetry criteria and their relation to physical parameters, we gain valuable insights into the formation and evolution of these structures.

Studies on the morphology of galaxy maps in radio passbands have led to the development of morphological classifications that can lead to understanding the formation and evolution of AGN jets. The first classification scheme proposed by Fanaroff & Riley (1974) categorized radio galaxies into two groups: FRI and FRII. The FRI class is characterized by intensity peaks near the center, while the FRII class has intensity peaks near the edge. Recent studies have added compact radio sources as a third class, known as FR0 radio galaxies (Baldi et al. 2015). Research has shown correlations between radio morphology and other galaxy properties, including environmental factors. FRI radio galaxies are typically associated with dense environments and low excitation indices, while FRIIs are more prevalent in low-density environments with high-excitation AGN activity (Hill & Lilly 1991; Baum et al. 1995; Gendre et al. 2010, 2013).

Subclasses of FRIs, such as bent-tailed, wide-angle-tailed (WAT), and HT radio galaxies, are useful in identifying overdensities as their jets are bent due to galaxy movement within a group or cluster (Blanton et al. 2000, 2001; Dehghan et al. 2014; O'Brien et al. 2015). The properties of radio sources with compact morphologies, such as FR0, gigahertz peaked spectrum (GPS), and compact steep-spectrum (CSS), are still being discussed as they may represent distinct populations of radio galaxies (O'Dea & Saikia 2021).

The advent of new high-resolution and sensitive radio surveys has necessitated a reevaluation of existing morphological classifications. To address this, machine-learning techniques have been employed to develop automated methods for morphological-based classification of radio galaxies (Aniyan & Thorat 2017; An et al. 2018; Lukic et al. 2018; Tang et al. 2019; Sadeghi et al. 2021). In the context of Low Frequency Array (LOFAR), novel models combining machine-learning algorithms and image analysis have been utilized, incorporating optical features of host galaxies and morphological parameters for classification pur-

poses (Alegre et al. 2022; Barkus et al. 2022). Traditional classifications based on the location of peak intensity have been updated to account for more intricate structures observed in radio galaxy maps. Mingo et al. (2019) revealed a significant population of FRI-classified radio galaxies with core-dominant morphology transitioning from FRIIs. They also identified complex structures that do not fit within current classification definitions. Miraghaei & Best (2017) reported sources without classification, highlighting the diversity of galaxy morphologies. Given the diverse nature of galaxy morphologies observed through modern telescopes, it is essential to introduce novel automatic methods for quantifying morphologies and investigating radio maps.

In previous works, radio sources were often classified as “symmetrical” based on their compact or medium-symmetric appearance, determined manually through source brightness (Bridle et al. 1994; Readhead et al. 1996; Augusto et al. 2006). However, this classification did not automatically consider the morphological-based definition of symmetry. Bera et al. (2020) examined the symmetrical morphology of unique features like X-shaped and Z-shaped radio galaxies, considering the brightness of lobes and the angle between minor and major axes.

Some studies have focused on asymmetry and its correlation with physical parameters and environmental factors in radio galaxies. The researchers in Lara et al. (2004) proposed three possible reasons for apparent asymmetry, while Laing et al. (1999) and Hocuk & Barthel (2010) discussed asymmetry in relation to luminosity and orientation, respectively. Orientation is one of the crucial parameters that has been extensively discussed in many articles concerning radio galaxies (e.g., Podigachoski et al. 2015). Asymmetry can be observed in flux density maps, spectral index, and lobe size (Taylor et al. 1996a, 1996b; Dennett-Thorpe et al. 1999; Augusto et al. 2006). The literature also reports the detection of asymmetries in radio galaxy maps (Gopal-Krishna 2004). In this regard, FR hybrid radio galaxies exhibit FRI characteristics on one side and FRII characteristics on the other. These asymmetries may result from orientation and line-of-sight effects, interactions between jets and the environment, or they may have fundamental explanations (Gopal-Krishna 2000; Harwood et al. 2020; Gawroński et al. 2006; Cegłowski et al. 2013).

Finally, some studies have investigated asymmetry by using the fractional separation difference to assign physical properties to this measure based on the relative positions of radio intensity peaks (Banhatti 1980; Arshakian & Longair 2000; Jimenez-Gallardo et al. 2019).

The physical parameters of astrophysical objects, such as their size, temperature, density, magnetic field strength, and velocity, can have a significant impact on their radio emissions. The radio emissions from celestial objects are often associated with various physical processes, including synchrotron radiation, free-free emission, and thermal bremsstrahlung radiation (Pacholczyk 1970). The intensity of free-free emission depends on the temperature and density of the plasma, with higher temperatures and densities leading to stronger radio emission (Condon 1992). The intensity and spectral shape of synchrotron emission depend

on the strength and distribution of magnetic field, as well as the energy distribution of the emitting particles (Longair 2011). The relationship between the physical parameters of astrophysical objects and their radio emissions has been extensively studied and documented in scientific literature (McCarthy et al. 1987; Wolter et al. 1994; Das et al. 2022).

This study builds upon previous research (Javaherian et al. 2023, hereafter referred to as paper I) that introduced a parameter known as symmetry. We provide an explanation of the methodology employed in the earlier study to address any ambiguities and enhance its clarity. The primary objective of our current investigation is to report the relationships between symmetry as a morphological-based parameter and other characteristics of galaxies. The layout of this article is as follows: Section 2 provides an explanation of the radio galaxy data sets and employed optical data. In Section 3, we present a review of the methodology employed in paper I for morphological analysis of radio galaxies, focusing on parameters associated with symmetry to identify their differences. To accomplish this, we offer a comprehensive workflow that encompasses preprocessing, segmentation, and parameter extraction procedures. In Section 4, we study the relationship between the physical parameters of radio galaxies (such as size, redshift, stellar mass, black hole mass, concentration, and star formation rate (SFR)) and their symmetries. Indeed, we report findings including relationships between symmetry and other properties available from the optical and radio data. Finally, Section 5 presents concluding remarks.

2.1. Description of Radio Data Sets

The radio observations and data of radio galaxy samples have been extracted from two main radio surveys: the first data release of the LOFAR Two-meter Sky Survey (LoTSS DR1; Shimwell et al. 2017, 2019; Williams et al. 2019) and the Faint Images of the Radio Sky at Twenty-centimeters (FIRST; Becker et al. 1995) survey. LoTSS is a large radio survey that maps the entire northern sky at low radio frequencies (120–168 MHz) using the LOFAR telescope (van Haarlem et al. 2013). The LoTSS DR1 includes high-quality images and catalogs of over 300,000 radio sources detected in the survey. The FIRST radio survey, conducted at a frequency of 1.4 GHz (20-centimeter wavelength), utilizes the National Radio Astronomy Observatory’s Very Large Array (VLA). The FIRST survey detects and catalogs faint radio sources, covering the entire northern sky visible from the VLA.

The radio galaxy catalogs used in this study were selected based on the surveys presented by Miraghaei & Best (2017) and Mingo et al. (2019). Miraghaei & Best (2017) cataloged 1329 morphologically classified extended radio sources based on their 1.4 GHz radio emissions. The catalog contains radio galaxies classified as FRI, FR II, and FR hybrid, with a few sources left unclassified. In total, 608 galaxies were classified as FRI, 646 as FR II, 35 as FR hybrid, and 40 as unclassified. The radio sources were also labeled as wide-angle tailed, head-tailed (HT), diffuse, and double-double radio galaxies. Mingo et al. (2019)

cataloged 5805 extended radio-loud AGNs based on LoTSS DR1 as FRI (2965), FRII (546), and intermediate (1241). Additional labels were included, such as small, narrow-angle tailed, wide-angle tailed, and double-double radio galaxies. The intermediate sources include those that are not FRI or FRII, such as hybrid FRs, core-dominated sources (core-Ds), or fuzzy blobs.

The radio data include FITS images of a sample of 67 radio galaxies at 1.4 GHz and 150 MHz. To obtain detailed morphological information about the sources, we utilized images obtained from the FIRST cutout server at 1.4 GHz, which offered a higher resolution (5) compared to similar 1.4 GHz radio data such as NRAO VLA Sky Survey (NVSS; Condon et al. 1998) images (45). This allowed us to capture more intricate details of the sources' morphologies. The noise level of these images was approximately 0.15 mJy.

Additionally, we utilized the LoTSS DR1 image cutout service to extract radio images at 150 MHz. These images were mapped at two different resolutions: high (6) and low (20). For our study, we specifically selected high-resolution radio images as they were comparable to the resolution of FIRST, while also being more effective in detecting lower surface brightness extended sources compared to FIRST.

The LoTSS DR1 has a median sensitivity (noise level) of $S_{144} = 71 \text{ Jy beam}^{-1}$, making it significantly more sensitive than the FIRST survey. Moreover, observing at lower frequencies offers the advantage of reduced contamination from spectral aging. The pixel sizes for FIRST and LoTSS were 1.8 and 1.5 , respectively.

To construct the radio galaxy sample, the sample of 1329 FR-classified radio galaxies introduced in Miraghaei & Best (2017) was crossmatched with the sample of 5805 classified radio galaxies presented in Mingo et al. (2019). Considering the overlapping field between the two catalogs, 67 sources were selected. The crossmatch was performed using TOPCAT (Taylor 2005) to identify the closest source in the Miraghaei & Best (2017) catalog to each FR radio galaxy in the Mingo et al. (2019) catalog. A 5 search radius was employed to avoid overlooking any objects, resulting in the selection of 80 sources at this stage. Subsequently, a visual inspection of sources from both catalogs was conducted to verify the accuracy of the matches. In addition to eliminating incorrect matches, five hybrid sources were excluded from the final catalog. Ultimately, 67 FRI/II radio galaxies were chosen for inclusion in this analysis. The final sample consists of 34 FRI and 33 FRII radio galaxies. The FR classes of sources were taken from Miraghaei & Best (2017).

A notable difference between the classifications of Miraghaei & Best (2017) and those of Mingo et al. (2019) lies in the number of FRIIs and intermediate sources. Some FRIIs reported in Miraghaei & Best (2017) were classified as FRIs in Mingo et al. (2019), but they were all labeled as “small.” Only two of them exhibited very diffused extended emissions detected by LOFAR antennas, which revealed their correct FR class. Conversely, some FRIs were classified

as intermediate by Mingo et al. (2019), likely due to the high sensitivity of the survey in detecting complex structures. It is worth mentioning that our study aimed to define a parameter for evaluating the morphological properties of extended radio galaxies, regardless of their specific classifications. Therefore, the discrepancies between different classification methods did not significantly impact our analysis. For our study, we relied on the classifications presented by Miraghaei & Best (2017) while utilizing image data from both catalogs.

The radio properties used in this study include radio flux density, radio luminosity, and radio size, all of which have been extracted from Miraghaei & Best (2017) at 1.4 GHz and Mingo et al. (2019) at 150 MHz. Sizes of radio sources are defined as the total extent of the radio emission of galaxies including the jets and the core. The estimated sizes at each frequency were drawn from their parent radio catalog. We used the rest-frame radio spectral luminosity calculated from flux densities, assuming a spectral index $\alpha = 0.75$ (where $S \propto \nu^{-\alpha}$). For additional information regarding the utilized data sets concerning FRI and FRII galaxies and their extracted morphological properties from FIRST and LoTSS data, please refer to Tables 1 and 2 in paper I.

2.2. Description of Optical Data

Host galaxy identification and main galaxy properties are provided by the optical data. The photometric and spectroscopic data from the seventh data release (DR7; Abazajian et al. 2009) of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS; York et al. 2000) have been exploited for this purpose. In this regard, the value-added spectroscopic catalogs of the SDSS produced by the group from the Max Planck Institute for Astrophysics and Johns Hopkins University (MPA-JHU; Brinchmann et al. 2004) include the main galaxy properties required in this work.

The relevant properties are extensively discussed and used in Kauffmann papers (Kauffmann et al. 2003a, 2003b, 2003c) and other citing papers based on the main galaxy properties of the SDSS. Total stellar mass, black hole mass, 4000 Å break strength, galaxy magnitude, half-light radius (R50), concentration (C), surface mass density (Σ), SFR, and redshift constitute the main set of galaxy optical properties. In the following, we briefly discuss them, and for a complete description of these properties, we refer readers to Mazoochi et al. (2022).

The stellar masses have been estimated via the relation: $\log(M_{\text{star}}) = \log(M/L) + 0.4(M - M_z)$, where M/L is the stellar mass-to-light ratio of the galaxies predicted by the model. The z -band luminosity is K -corrected and dust-corrected (see Kauffmann et al. 2003b for more details).

The black hole mass (M_{BH}) is obtained from the M - σ relation derived from Tremaine et al. (2002): $\log(M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot}) = 8.13 + 4.02 \log(\sigma/200 \text{ km s}^{-1})$. Here, σ is the velocity dispersion of the galaxies. Velocity dispersion is the result of Doppler shifting from the stellar spectra due to the stars' motion within the galaxy and has been estimated by analyzing the integrated spectrum of the

whole galaxy. Velocity dispersion estimations below 70 km s^{-1} , which correspond to the instrumental resolution of SDSS, are not reliable. This value falls significantly outside the range of data points in our study.

The stellar age of galaxies has been evaluated by the 4000 \AA break. This feature in the spectrum of galaxies is a result of the absorption of high-energy radiation from metals in the stellar atmosphere and a scarcity of hot blue stars, both of which are indicators of an old stellar population. The quantity is estimated as the ratio of the flux in the red continuum to that in the blue continuum via the following relation (Balogh et al. 1999): $D(4000) = \int_{3800}^{4000} f_{\lambda} d\lambda / \int_{4000}^{5000} f_{\lambda} d\lambda$, wherein f_{λ} is the flux density at wavelength λ .

The absolute magnitude (M_r) is the K-correction of the SDSS Petrosian r-band magnitude. Correspondingly, R50 (or R90) as a measure for galaxy size is the radius enclosing 50% (or 90%) of the Petrosian r-band luminosity of the galaxy (Shen et al. 2003). The surface mass density is the mean stellar mass surface density within the half-light radius, calculated via the relation $\Sigma_{50} = 0.5 M / (\pi R_{50}^2)$. Concentration index, defined as $C = R_{90}/R_{50}$, is an indicator for galaxy type. This parameter shows correlation with the optical morphology of galaxies (e.g., Strateva et al. 2001). The transition boundary between early-type and late-type galaxies is set at $C = 2.6$. The SFRs were estimated based on their relation with 4000 \AA break strength (see Brinchmann et al. 2004 for more details). The redshifts of sources are spectroscopic redshifts.

3. Methodology

We have developed a new method that incorporates various preprocessing steps, including noise reduction, segmentation based on histogram analysis and the k-means algorithm, and extraction of morphological parameters. The explanation of the proposed multi-step approach is as follows.

3.1. Segmentation Procedure

At this stage, we initially positioned the origin of each image at the center of the corresponding galaxy as seen in the visible spectrum. Subsequently, the intensities of pixels within each image were normalized relative to the maximum brightness present in that particular image. To ensure that subsequent data analysis was conducted above the minimum noise threshold, we employed wavelet denoising techniques on each image. This denoising step helped to enhance the signal-to-noise ratio and improve the overall quality of the data for further analysis (Donoho & Johnstone 1994; Gupta et al. 2013).

In the next step, we employed a segmentation process consisting of two main steps: histogram-based intensity thresholding and the utilization of the k-means clustering segmentation algorithm. The intensity threshold is initially established based on the normalized intensities relative to the maximum brightness of each image. We employed a data-driven approach to identify the optimal number of bins within histograms utilized in density estimation. The optimization

principle aims to minimize the expected loss function between the histogram and an unknown density function, with the assumption based solely on the independence of samples drawn from the density (Shimazaki & Shinomoto 2007). In our study, the typical number of bins obtained for various images ranged from 8 to 13. Since we deal with brighter pixels in images, the first bins which encompass numerous pixels with lower brightness levels must be excluded from the segmentation process. Excluding the pixels in the second and third bins may have a slight impact on the results. Therefore, the starting point of the second bin is adopted as the lower limit for the intensity thresholding.

Moving on to the next step, we employed the k-means clustering algorithm for image segmentation. This algorithm is an unsupervised iterative nondeterministic method that groups features into k clusters. In our case, the features were based on the intensities and locations of pixels in the image. To begin the segmentation, pixels with intensities smaller than the lower limit of the histogram (second bin) were excluded from the procedure. The remaining pixels were then utilized as input for the k-means clustering algorithm (Yousefzadeh et al. 2015).

To better understand how this algorithm works, imagine mapping the intensities and locations of pixels to a three-dimensional feature space. The intensities would represent the third dimension in this mapping. By considering the mean distances between pixels, those with similar brightness would be grouped together in the same clusters. The criterion for intensity classification into a specific cluster is based on proximity to the mean of that particular cluster. Here, the upper limit of clusters considered in making clusters of intensities is four. Indeed, the number of segments segregated from the background of a radio image can include any value between one and four.

To provide a mathematical rationale for this iterative clustering algorithm, its objective is to partition a given data set into k distinct clusters. Each cluster is represented by its centroid, which is the mean of the data points assigned to that cluster. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x\}$ be the data set with n data points, and let $K = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c\}$ be the set of centroids representing the clusters. The algorithm follows these steps:

1. **Initialization:** Randomly initialize the centroids c_1, c_2, \dots, c .
2. **Assignment:** Assign each data point x to the nearest centroid c based on the Euclidean distance $d(x, c) = \sqrt{\sum_{d=1}^{\Gamma} (x_d - c_d)^2}$, where Γ is the dimensionality of the data points.
3. **Update:** Update the centroids c by calculating the mean of the data points assigned to each cluster: $c = (1/|C|) \sum_{x \in C} x$, where C is the set of data points assigned to cluster j .
4. **Termination:** Repeat steps 2 and 3 until convergence criteria are met. Convergence is typically achieved when the centroids no longer change significantly or after a fixed number of iterations.

The k-means algorithm aims to minimize the within-cluster sum of squares, also known as the inertia, defined as $J = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{x \in C_j} \|x - c_j\|^2$, where

$\|x - c\|$ denotes the Euclidean distance between data point x and centroid c . The outputs of the segmentation procedures for FIRST and LoTSS galaxies are demonstrated in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. It should be mentioned that the cutout images in both FIRST and LoTSS data sets are the same size in radians but differ in the number of pixels due to varying data resolutions. For specific details of the cutout images (such as pixels and radians) in the two data sets, the reader can refer to Tables 1 and 2 in paper I.

3.2. Intensity-weighted Centroid, Orientation, and Eccentricity

Once the objects have been segmented, the region(s) with their intensities are preserved. To determine the intensity-weighted centroid (IWC), eccentricity, and orientation of each region, we employed the central moments of the image (Noori et al. 2019; Tajik et al. 2023). The central moments μ_{pq} of an image $I(x, y)$ are calculated using the following formula:

$$\mu_{pq} = \int \int (x - \bar{x})^p (y - \bar{y})^q I(x, y),$$

where (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) represents the centroid coordinates. For a binary image, the zero-order moment m_{00} represents the area A of the segmented region labeled as one. By determining the centroid, we can obtain the Cartesian coordinates of a quarter of the target. The orientation ϕ of the object relative to the positive x-axis can be expressed as:

$$\phi = 0.5 \arctan(2 \mu_{11} / (\mu_{20} - \mu_{02})).$$

By utilizing the orientation and fitting the bounding box of the object, we can calculate the major axis (a) and subsequently the minor axis (b) of its shape. Therefore, the eccentricity (e) can be determined through the following equation:

$$e = \sqrt{1 - b^2/a^2}.$$

Figure 3 illustrates ellipses with different eccentricities aligned along the positive x-axis ($\phi = 0$).

3.3. Symmetry Definition

The definition we propose for symmetry is not influenced by the spatial orientation of the galaxy in the image. The only requirements are that the center of the captured image aligns with the optical center of the galaxy and that all images have an equal area (5×5). To establish symmetry parameters related to the center of galaxies in the optical band, we need to consider symmetry criteria based on the morphological characteristics of the extracted regions in galaxy maps. The code takes the size of the image as input to determine a quarter of the segmented region and the distance between the intensity centroid of the region and the center of the image (i.e., the center of the galaxy in the optical band).

For an image with a single segmented region, we calculate the symmetry of the region, denoted as Σ , by multiplying two symmetries: one related to the

proximity of the region centroid to the center of the image (proximity), and the other related to the eccentricity of the region (eccentricity). For example, for an elongated object with $e = 0.9$ (see Figure 3), we obtain eccentricity = 0.1 (i.e., $1 - e$). When dealing with an image containing multiple segmented regions, in addition to the previous symmetries (with a slight difference in the definition of proximity), we also define two symmetries associated with the quarters (quarter) and orientations (orientation) of the segmented regions. The range of all symmetries is $[0, 1]$. A symmetry value of one indicates the highest level of symmetry for the region, while a value of zero represents the lowest level of symmetry. The multiplication of these symmetries results in a final symmetry value specific to the case of interest, which also falls within the range $[0, 1]$.

We describe in detail four different cases depending on the number of segregated regions observed in each map:

Case 1: This case corresponds to radio maps with only one segmented region. It involves analyzing a segmented region in an image that is either close to or far from the center (as shown by the green circles in Shape I of Figure 4). The first symmetry parameter is defined based on the proximity of the IWC of a region to the center of the image (i.e., the center of the galaxy in the optical band). A proximity measure, denoted as proximity, is assigned a value of one if the centroid of the region is at the center of the image. A value of zero is assigned when the centroid is positioned exactly at the outer edge of the circle enclosed by the square, which represents the image data. This indicates that the centroid coincides with the boundary of the circle within the square region. For instance, for an image with 201×201 pixels, we consider a circle with a radius of 100 pixels where the center of the circle is located at the 101st pixel. If the IWC of a segmented region falls on the circumference of the circle enclosed by the square (i.e., image data), proximity = 0. Please refer to Figure 4, Shape I, Regions 2 and 3.

To account for the fact that circle-like shapes exhibit more symmetry than elongated shapes, we introduce a second measure of symmetry related to the eccentricity parameter. If the eccentricity of a shape returns a value of zero (indicating a circle), we assign a symmetry measure, denoted as eccentricity, a value of one. Conversely, shapes with eccentricities of 1 (representing a line) are assigned a value of zero for eccentricity. Therefore, the multiplication of these parameters, proximity \times eccentricity, yields a symmetry criterion, denoted as Σ , ranging from zero (completely asymmetric) to one (perfectly symmetric).

For example, let us consider the case of a segmented radio galaxy with ID number 43 (refer to Table 2 in paper I) in the LoTSS data. The distance of its IWC to the center of the image is one pixel (1.5), and the image size is 202×202 . The distance from the center of the image to the end of the area of interest can be calculated as 101 (151.5). Therefore, proximity is calculated as 0.99 (i.e., $1 - (1.5/151.5)$). As we selected all image tiles in both catalogs with an area of 5×5 and the specified criterion is formulated to yield symmetry values within the range of 0–1, the results are not affected by the image size

(i.e., the unit of arcsec is omitted from the numerator and denominator of the fraction in the defined formula).

Additionally, the eccentricity of the object is 0.80, resulting in an eccentricity value of 0.20 (i.e., $1 - 0.80$). Consequently, the multiplication of these parameters yields a symmetry criterion $\Sigma = 0.99 \times 0.20 = 0.20$.

Case 2: This case involves radio maps with two segmented regions. The symmetry for the two regions is determined by two parameters: quarters and proximity. To define symmetry in terms of quarters, we consider the IWCs of the regions. We use the notations q_1 and q_2 to represent the quarters in which the IWCs of the first and second segments appear, respectively. The centroids must be in quarters where the absolute difference between q_1 and q_2 is 2. If the centroids are in quarters 1 and 3, or quarters 2 and 4, then the symmetry parameter $quarter = 1$; otherwise, it is 0.

The proximity of the centroids to the center of the image is another parameter. We update the definition of proximity to illustrate symmetry in two-segmented sources. When the centroids are equidistant from the center of the image, $proximity = 1$. If they are farthest apart, with one at the point closest to the center and the other at the farthest point from the center (on a radius of the circle), then $proximity = 0$. To compute proximity, we use the formula:

$$proximity = 1 - |D_{q_1} - D_{q_2}| / (0.5 \times \text{radius of the circle}),$$

where D_{q_1} and D_{q_2} are the distances of the centroids from the center of the image in quarters q_1 and q_2 , respectively. Thus, the defined criterion is structured to produce symmetry values within the range of 0–1. As we previously mentioned, since we selected images with the same size of 5×5 , the results are not affected by the image size.

The similarity of orientation is captured by two additional parameters: eccentricity and orientation. For eccentricity, if the regions in two quarters have the same eccentricities, $eccentricity = 1$. If the difference between eccentricities is maximum ($1 - 0 = 1$) for the two regions, then $eccentricity = 0$. The formula used to compute eccentricity is:

$$eccentricity = 1 - |e_{q_1} - e_{q_2}|,$$

where e_{q_1} and e_{q_2} are the eccentricities of regions in quarters q_1 and q_2 , respectively.

For orientation, if two regions have the same angles of orientation, $orientation = 1$. If the bending angle between two regions is 90° , then $orientation = 0$. The formula used to compute orientation is:

$$orientation = 1 - |\phi_{q_1} - \phi_{q_2}| / 90^\circ,$$

where ϕ_{q_1} and ϕ_{q_2} are the orientations of regions in quarters q_1 and q_2 , respectively.

The symmetry criterion for two regions is given by the multiplication of all these parameters:

$$\Sigma = \text{quarter} \times \text{proximity} \times \text{eccentricity} \times \text{orientation}.$$

For example, we analyze the symmetry parameters for a radio galaxy with ID number 1 in FIRST data. Since $|2 - 4| = 2$, $\text{quarter} = 1$. Using an image size of 201×201 pixels, we compute $\text{proximity} = 1 - (|100 - 50| / 100) = 0.5$. The eccentricity of the object is 0.93, resulting in $\text{eccentricity} = 1 - (0.93 - 0.93) = 1$. The orientation of the object is 90° , giving $\text{orientation} = 1 - (90 / 90) = 0$. The multiplication of these parameters gives $\Sigma = 0$.

We present two potential configurations of artificial segments that mimic galaxies (objects with green color) in Figure 5. We consider two configurations satisfying the condition $q - q = 2$. The reader can refer to the caption of Figure 5 for detailed explanations of the illustrations and symmetry computations for this typical example.

Case 3: This scenario pertains to radio maps that feature three segmented regions. In this case, the only accepted system of positioning regions is as follows: two regions in the same quarter, and the third region in another quarter, provided that $|q - q| = 2$ (refer to Shape II in Figure 4 for one of the acceptable configurations). To proceed, we first determine the centroid, as well as the mean eccentricities and orientations, of the two segments in one quarter. We follow the same approach as in the previous case. Based on this, we can determine whether $\text{quarter} = 1$. An example that satisfies this criterion is the radio galaxy with ID number 15 in the LoTSS data (see Table 1 in paper I), which exhibits three segregated regions within two quarters: one region in the first quarter and two regions in the third quarter. Since $|1 - 3| = 2$, we have $\text{quarter} = 1$.

Among the 67 galaxies in the two catalogs, two galaxies in the FIRST catalog and three galaxies in the LoTSS catalog have three segments. Out of the two galaxies (with ID numbers 44 and 61) from the FIRST catalog, one (with ID number 61) met our defined symmetry condition regarding quarters, while the other (representing $1/67$ of the entire FIRST data set) takes a symmetry value of zero. Among the three galaxies from the LoTSS catalog (with ID numbers 15, 21, and 24), one (with ID number 15) satisfies the defined symmetry criterion, while the remaining two (equivalent to $2/67$ of the entire LoTSS data set) take a symmetry value of zero. According to our symmetry definition, if the defined condition is not met, no symmetry is observed relative to the optical center.

In the subsequent step, we calculate the centroid of the two regions in the same quarter as the weighted centroids of the two regions (represented by the red circles in Shape II of Figure 4). Subsequently, we compare the distances between the two centroids and the center of the image in quarters 1 and 3. We then proceed with the same method as the previous case to determine proximity. We use the means of the eccentricities and orientations of the regions in the same quarter. These values are then compared with the eccentricities and orientations of the region in the other quarter, respectively. Consequently, we can define a

symmetric criterion for the positioning of three regions in a radio map using the last relation provided in Case 2 for the two regions.

Case 4: This scenario corresponds to radio maps featuring four segmented regions. For this case, there are three configurations, all meeting the condition of $|q - q| = 2$. Among the various types of positioning for four regions in radio maps, we can establish symmetric criteria for only two systems of positioning.

In the first type of positioning, each quarter contains a region composed of four segmented parts. For the two regions whose quarters satisfy the condition $|q - q| = 2$, we apply the principles outlined in Case 2. Consequently, the requirements of symmetry must solely be fulfilled by the two regions that face each other with respect to the optical center.

In the second type of positioning, two regions are situated in the same quarter, while the other two regions are located in another quarter, provided that $|q - q| = 2$. Similar to the previous case involving two regions in a quarter, we can perform all necessary tasks for the two regions in their respective quarters. This involves determining the centroids and calculating the means of eccentricities and orientations for the regions in each quarter. Then, we can compare all the obtained parameters, similar to Case 2, to establish the symmetric criterion.

It is worth mentioning that among the 67 galaxies in the two catalogs, one galaxy (i.e., 1/67 of the entire data set) in the FIRST catalog (with ID number 15) and one galaxy (i.e., 1/67 of the entire data set) in the LoTSS catalog (with ID number 57) have four segments. Their symmetry value is zero because they do not have the defined quarter-based symmetry.

We computed symmetry for FRI and FRII galaxies using FIRST (F_{Σ}) and LoTSS (L_{Σ}) data sets (Table 1). The mean symmetries for images with one segmented region are 0.11 for both FIRST and LoTSS data sets. For images with two segmented regions, the mean symmetries are 0.39 and 0.32 for FIRST and LoTSS sets, respectively. Images with three or four regions have lower mean symmetries. As seen in Table 1, the highest symmetry value belongs to a type 2 galaxy (ID = 53) with two segmented regions, with symmetries of 0.88 in FIRST data and 0.70 in LoTSS data.

4.1. Symmetry and Main Properties of Galaxies

In this section, we use the parameter defined and calculated to quantify morphological symmetry in radio maps of galaxies and investigate any relation between symmetry and properties of the host galaxy. There are two sets of properties: (1) radio properties, which include radio size, radio flux density, and radio luminosity; and (2) optical properties, which include stellar mass, black hole mass, R_{50} , concentration, Σ , stellar age, and SFR. We examine the total sample of radio galaxies and the FRI and FRII subsamples to find if there are any type-dependent behaviors related to the symmetry parameter.

In the first step, we plot symmetry versus other properties of galaxies in Figures 6–17. Figures 6–7 display scatter plots depicting the relationship between symmetry and sizes of radio sources in various passbands. Across all right-hand sides of the scatter plots, there is a noticeable decrease in the total means of symmetries with increasing sizes. In both panels of Figure 8, a downward trend in total means of symmetries is observed as flux densities increase. The scatter plots in Figure 9 depicting symmetries of galaxies and their luminosities illustrate that the total mean of symmetries remains approximately constant from low to high luminosities. Analyzing the scatter plots of symmetries and redshifts in Figure 10 reveals that the total mean symmetries at higher redshifts are relatively less than those at lower redshifts.

The scatter plots of symmetries versus stellar masses in Figure 11 reach a maximum value in total means of symmetries near $10^{11} M_{\odot}$. Subsequently, the total means of symmetries gradually decrease to $10^{11.5} M_{\odot}$ in both the FIRST and LoTSS data sets. However, the trend of the total mean on the left-side scatter increases, contrary to the right-side scatter.

Figure 12 displays scatter plots of symmetries versus black hole masses. The total means of symmetries demonstrate fluctuations around 0.2 and 0.15 for FIRST (left panel) and LoTSS (right panel), respectively. The scatter plots of symmetries versus R50, which is an optical size for the host galaxies of radio sources, are represented in Figure 13. The left scatter plot of Figure 13 shows an almost downward trend in mean symmetry of FIRST data from lower to higher values of R50, while the mean symmetry of LoTSS data is approximately constant throughout the x-axis in the right panel. The mean symmetries reach their minimum values around the concentration value of 3.2 in both scatter plots of Figure 14. In both scatter plots of Figure 15, we observe an increasing trend for mean symmetries after the value of $10^{8.9} M_{\odot} \text{ kpc}^{-2}$. Looking at the scatter plots of symmetries versus stellar age, we find that there is a maximum symmetry around the stellar age of 1.75 for both panels of Figure 16. Subsequently, the trends of mean symmetries decrease for both plots around stellar ages of 2.05 and 2.15 for FIRST and LoTSS data sets, respectively. Figure 17 illustrates the scatter plots of symmetries versus SFR, showing that the mean symmetry generally increases with rising SFR in LoTSS data.

In addition to the mean value of each bin displayed by “+” in all figures, we also computed medians to characterize the typical values of the symmetry distributions in each individual bin. Given the limited sample size and the small number of sources allocated to various bins, we employed the bootstrapping method (Efron & Tibshirani 1993) as one of the resampling approaches to find uncertainties associated with the medians. The results for all bins of Figures 6–17 are expressed in Table 2. In the majority of bins, the trends of the medians correspond with the means.

The three well-known correlation coefficients have been used to evaluate the confidence level of the correlations between symmetries of radio galaxies obtained from two catalogs and their physical parameters. Since the Pearson correla-

tion is limited to Gaussian-distributed data points, we provide the Spearman and Kendall correlations. Table 3 lists the different correlation coefficients in addition to the corresponding p-values for the total sample of radio galaxies. Similar results have been obtained when analyzing the data using Spearman and Kendall ranked correlation coefficients, as well as Pearson correlation.

For the total sample of FR radio galaxies (black dotted line), the symmetry appears to be correlated with >95% confidence to the radio size (Figures 6 and 7). Larger galaxies in radio size show a smaller symmetry index. This is consistent with our expectation about symmetry: as we examine larger resolved sources, more detailed structures appear in the map, breaking the symmetry. This result shows that the defined symmetry index is affected by the resolution of radio maps. The correlation is also present for FRI and FR II in the left panels of Figures 6 and 7. Other properties do not show strong correlations with symmetry except R50 for FRI in Figure 13, stellar age for the total galaxy sample in Figure 16, and 150 MHz luminosity for FRI in Figure 8.

The correlation between radio luminosity and symmetry can also be explained due to the size–luminosity relation. Larger sources show higher radio power. The R50- and stellar age-correlations can also be biased by the size of sources. This should be examined using larger samples of radio galaxies fixed in radio size.

4.2. Symmetry and FR Classification

The plots of symmetry for FRI and FR II radio galaxies at 1.4 GHz and 150 MHz maps are shown in Figure 18. The median values of symmetries for FRI and FR II are 0.05 ± 0.04 and 0.14 ± 0.02 , respectively, in the FIRST data set. These values for FRI and FR II are 0.06 ± 0.04 and 0.13 ± 0.04 , respectively, in the LoTSS data set. The uncertainty values are computed by the bootstrapping method.

FR IIs show higher symmetry than FRI radio galaxies. In Section 4.1, we demonstrated that the defined symmetry parameter is slightly correlated with the size of radio sources in our sample. In this section, we examine if the higher symmetry observed in FR IIs is affected by this relation. To investigate this, we plot the radio size of FRI and FR II radio galaxies in Figure 19. The median values of radio sizes for FRI and FR II are 57.47 ± 9.10 and 31.28 ± 7.20 arcseconds, respectively, in the FIRST data set. These values for FRI and FR II are 116.08 ± 20.10 and 61.37 ± 12.04 arcseconds, respectively, in the LoTSS data set. The uncertainty values are computed by the bootstrapping method.

FR IIs show lower radio size than FR Is. Therefore, higher symmetry is expected. To remove the bias caused by source size, we need to create matched samples of FRI and FR II in size and then compare their symmetry indices.

To make a uniformly matched sample, we adopt four different methods: (i) We selected FRI/FR II pairs that were closest in size, with a size difference of less

than 30 . This method results in 15 unique pairs. (ii) We randomly matched an FRI with an FRII in size, with a size difference of less than 30 . This method results in 20 unique pairs. (iii) We chose an FRI and found the closest FRII in size to pair with the least size difference. This method results in 25 unique pairs. (iv) We chose an FRII and found the closest FRI in size to pair with the least size difference. This method results in 26 unique pairs.

All four methods build similar distributions of FRI/FRII in radio sizes. Then, we compare the distributions of symmetry index for FRI/FRIIs. The confidence levels of differences have been estimated using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test (Miraghaei 2020). For this aim, we make cumulative distributions of FRI/FRII matched samples normalized to unity and evaluate the maximum differences between the two samples to find the corresponding levels at which the null hypothesis is rejected. FRIIs in all subsamples show higher symmetry with confidence levels of 85%, 90%, 97.5%, and 95% for methods i to iv, respectively. Therefore, the results of matched comparisons show that FRIIs have higher symmetry than FRIs. This result is not affected by the symmetry-size relation that we found in Section 4.1.

5. Conclusions

The current paper is the second in our developing research on symmetry in radio galaxies. Paper I mostly includes a description of data and definition of symmetry and related techniques. In this article (paper II), we delve more deeply into the involved image segmentation process using intensity thresholding based on histogram analysis and the k-means clustering algorithm that performs grouping of pixels with similar intensities into clusters based on mean distances. This allows for effective region extraction and morphological parameter derivation for symmetry definition.

We explained in detail a symmetry criterion (based on paper I) for different types of galaxies in various data sets. We explored the relationship between morphological symmetry in radio maps of galaxies and various properties of the host galaxy through scatter plots. The analysis is divided into two sets of properties: optical properties (such as stellar mass, black hole mass, R50, concentration, 50, and stellar age) and radio properties (including radio flux density, radio luminosity, and radio size). We examined the total sample of radio galaxies as well as the FRI and FRII subsamples, plotting the symmetry parameter against other galaxy properties. The results show a correlation between symmetry and radio size, with larger galaxies displaying a smaller symmetry index. This correlation can be attributed to the resolution of the radio maps, as more detailed structures become visible in larger resolved sources, breaking the symmetry. Additionally, some weak correlations are observed between symmetry and other properties, such as R50 for FRI and stellar age for the total galaxy sample. We suggest that further examination using larger samples of radio galaxies, fixed in radio size, is needed to confirm these correlations.

Furthermore, we focused on the symmetry differences between FRI and FR II radio galaxies. We present a plot of symmetry for FRI and FR II radio galaxies at 1.4 GHz and 150 MHz maps, showing that FR IIs exhibit higher symmetry compared to FR Is. To investigate if this higher symmetry is influenced by the size of radio sources, we plotted the radio size of FRI and FR II radio galaxies. It is observed that FR IIs have a lower radio size than FR Is, which would explain the higher symmetry. To remove the size bias, four different methods of matching FRI and FR II samples in size were applied. The matched comparisons show that FR IIs consistently have higher symmetry than FR Is, independent of the symmetry-size relation. The results suggest that the higher symmetry observed in FR IIs is not solely influenced by the size of radio sources.

We emphasize the significant influence of the environment on shaping radio galaxies. Consequently, a crucial aspect of our investigation involves exploring the correlation between symmetry and the environment of these galaxies. Our findings highlight increased symmetry in FR II radio galaxies, underscoring the impact of environment in disrupting the symmetry of radio sources. This observation is particularly noteworthy as FR IIs are consistently found in lower-density environments compared to FR Is. We make a preliminary report of our results; a larger sample would improve the outcome when it becomes publicly available.

Our future investigation will focus on several aspects. First, each method is not perfect and can be improved by new ideas and definitions. Our definition of symmetry in the case of proximity is not invariant relative to scaling and may be made scale-invariant. Since the sources we work with have a consistent size of 5', the results are not affected by the definition of proximity. Second, we aim to enhance the statistical analysis by utilizing a larger sample of radio galaxies. Third, we plan to explore the relationship between symmetry and the environments of these galaxies by incorporating appropriate parameters (Sabater et al. 2013) to characterize the host galaxy's environment. Lastly, we recognize the importance of refining the definition of symmetry for our future research endeavors.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the reviewer for his/her very helpful and constructive comments and suggestions.

References

- Abazajian, K. N., Adelman-McCarthy, J. K., Agüeros, M. A., et al. 2009, *ApJS*, 182, 543
- Alegre, L., Sabater, J., Best, P., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 516, 4716
- An, F. X., Stach, S. M., Smail, I., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 862, 101
- Aniyan, A. K., & Thorat, K. 2017, *ApJS*, 230, 20
- Arshakian, T. G., & Longair, M. S. 2000, *MNRAS*, 311, 846

- Augusto, P., Gonzalez-Serrano, J. I., Perez-Fournon, I., & Wilkinson, P. N. 2006, *MNRAS*, 368, 1411
- Baldi, R. D., Capetti, A., & Giovannini, G. 2015, *A&A*, 576, A38
- Balogh, M. L., Morris, S. L., Yee, H., Carlberg, R., & Ellingson, E. 1999, *ApJ*, 527, 54
- Banhatti, D. G. 1980, *A&A*, 84, 112
- Barkus, B., Croston, J. H., Piotrowska, J., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 509, 1
- Baum, S. A., Zirbel, E. L., & O'Dea, C. P. 1995, *ApJ*, 451, 88
- Becker, R. H., White, R. L., & Helfand, D. J. 1995, *ApJ*, 450, 559
- Bera, S., Pal, S., Sasmal, T. K., & Mondal, S. 2020, *ApJS*, 251, 9
- Best, P. N., Longair, M. S., & Roettgering, H. J. A. 1997, *MNRAS*, 292, 758
- Birzan, L., McNamara, B. R., Nulsen, P. E. J., Carilli, C. L., & Wise, M. W. 2008, *ApJ*, 686, 859
- Blanton, E. L., Gregg, M. D., Helfand, D. J., Becker, R. H., & Leighly, K. M. 2001, *AJ*, 121, 2915
- Blanton, E. L., Gregg, M. D., Helfand, D. J., Becker, R. H., & White, R. L. 2000, *ApJ*, 531, 118
- Bridle, A. H., Hough, D. H., Lonsdale, C. J., Burns, J. O., & Laing, R. A. 1994, *AJ*, 108, 766
- Brinchmann, J., Charlot, S., White, S. D. M., et al. 2004, *MNRAS*, 351, 1151
- Cegłoński, M., Gawroński, M. P., & Kunert-Bajraszewska, M. 2013, *A&A*, 557, A75
- Chibueze, J. O., Sakemi, H., Ohmura, T., et al. 2021, *Natur*, 593, 47
- Condon, J. J. 1992, *ARA&A*, 30, 575
- Condon, J. J., Cotton, W. D., Greisen, E. W., et al. 1998, *AJ*, 115, 1693
- Cornwell, T. J., Saikia, D. J., Shastri, P., et al. 1986, *JApA*, 7, 119
- Das, B., Chandra, P., Shultz, M. E., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 517, 5756
- de Gasperin, F., Rudnick, L., Finoguenov, A., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 659, A146
- Dehghan, S., Johnston-Hollitt, M., Franzen, T. M. O., Norris, R. P., & Miller, N. A. 2014, *AJ*, 148, 75
- Dennett-Thorpe, J., Bridle, A. H., Laing, R. A., & Scheuer, P. A. G. 1999, *MNRAS*, 304, 271
- Donoho, D. L., & Johnstone, I. M. 1994, *Biometrika*, 81, 425
- Efron, B., & Tibshirani, R. J. 1993, *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*, *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability* No. 57 (Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC)
- Fanaroff, B. L., & Riley, J. M. 1974, *MNRAS*, 167, 31P
- Gawroński, M. P., Marecki, A., Kunert-Bajraszewska, M., & Kus, A. J. 2006, *A&A*, 447, 63
- Gendre, M. A., Best, P. N., & Wall, J. V. 2010, *MNRAS*, 404, 1719
- Gendre, M. A., Best, P. N., Wall, J. V., & Ker, L. M. 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, 3086
- Gopal-Krishna, & Wiita, P. J. 2000, *A&A*, 363, 507
- Gopal-Krishna, & Wiita, P. J. 2002, *New Astron. Rev.*, 46, 357
- Gupta, V., Mahle, R., & Shriwas, R. S. 2013, *Image denoising using wavelet transform method in 2013 Tenth Int. Conf. on Wireless and Optical Communications Networks (WOCN) (Bhopal, India, 26-28 July 2013) (IEEE) 1*,

2151-7703

- Hajdukovic, D. S. 2010, *EL*, 89, 49001
- Hardcastle, M., & Croston, J. 2020, *NewAR*, 88, 101539
- Hardcastle, M. J., Sakelliou, I., & Worrall, D. M. 2005, *MNRAS*, 359, 1007
- Harwood, J. J., Vernstrom, T., & Stroe, A. 2020, *MNRAS*, 491, 803
- Heckman, T. M., & Best, P. N. 2014, *ARA&A*, 52, 589
- Hill, G. J., & Lilly, S. J. 1991, *ApJ*, 367, 1
- Hocuk, S., & Barthel, P. D. 2010, *A&A*, 523, A9
- Javaherian, M., Miraghaei, H., & Moradpour, H. 2023, *AJ*, 166, 124
- Jimenez-Gallardo, A., Massaro, F., Capetti, A., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 627, A108
- Kauffmann, G., Heckman, T. M., White, S. D. M., et al. 2003a, *MNRAS*, 341, 33
- Kauffmann, G., Heckman, T. M., White, S. D. M., et al. 2003b, *MNRAS*, 341, 54
- Kauffmann, G., Heckman, T. M., Tremonti, C., et al. 2003c, *MNRAS*, 346, 1055
- Kornreich, D. A., Haynes, M. P., & Lovelace, R. V. E. 1998, *AJ*, 116, 2154
- Kravtsov, A. V., & Borgani, S. 2012, *ARA&A*, 50, 353
- Laing, R. A., Parma, P., de Ruiter, H. R., & Fanti, R. 1999, *MNRAS*, 306, 513
- Lara, L., Giovannini, G., Cotton, W. D., et al. 2004, *A&A*, 421, 899
- Longair, M. S. 2011, *High Energy Astrophysics* (3rd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
- Lukic, V., Brügggen, M., Banfield, J. K., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 476, 246
- Mantovani, F., Fanti, R., Ferrari, C., Cotton, W., & Muxlow, T. W. B. 2003, *A&A*, 399, 449
- Mazharimosavi, S. H., Halilsoy, M., Sakalli, I., & Gurtug, O. 2010, *CQGra*, 27, 105005
- Mazoochi, F., Miraghaei, H., & Riazi, N. 2022, *PASA*, 39, e021
- McCarthy, P. J., van Breugel, W., Spinrad, H., & Djorgovski, S. 1987, *ApJL*, 321, L29
- Mingo, B., Croston, J. H., Hardcastle, M. J., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 488, 2701
- Miraghaei, H. 2020, *Astron. J*, 160, 227
- Miraghaei, H., & Best, P. N. 2017, *MNRAS*, 466, 4346
- Mo, H., van den Bosch, F., & White, S. 2010, *Galaxy Formation and Evolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
- Morganti, R., Tadhunter, C. N., Oosterloo, T. A., et al. 2003, *PASA*, 20, 129
- Noori, M., Javaherian, M., Safari, H., & Nadjari, H. 2019, *AdSpR*, 64, 504
- O'Brien, A. N., Tothill, N. F. H., Norris, R. P., & Filipović, M. D. 2015, *Proc. of "The Many Facets of Extragalactic Radio Surveys: Towards New Scientific Challenges"*
- O'Dea, C. P., & Saikia, D. J. 2021, *A&ARv*, 29, 3
- Pacholczyk, A. 1970, *Radio Astrophysics: Nonthermal Processes in Galactic and Extragalactic Sources*, *Astronomy and Astrophysics Series* (San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman)
- Pérez-Torres, M.-A., & De Breuck, C. 2005, *MNRAS*, 363, L41
- Podigachoski, P., Barthel, P., Haas, M., Leipski, C., & Wilkes, B. 2015, *ApJL*, 806, L11

- Readhead, A. C. S., Taylor, G. B., Xu, W., et al. 1996, ApJ, 460, 612
- Rys, S. 1994, A&A, 281, 15
- Sabater, J., Best, P. N., & Argudo-Fernández, M. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 638
- Sadeghi, M., Javaherian, M., & Miraghaei, H. 2021, AJ, 161, 94
- Saikia, D. J., Jeyakumar, S., Mantovani, F., et al. 2003, PASA, 20, 50
- Saikia, D. J., Shastri, P., Sinha, R. P., Kapahi, V. K., & Swarup, G. 1984, JApA, 5, 429
- Sarazin, C. L. 1988, X-ray Emission from Clusters of Galaxies (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
- Sarzi, M., Falcón-Barroso, J., Davies, R. L., et al. 2006, MNRAS, 366, 1151
- Schweizer, F. 1997, in Proc. of the 186th Symp. of the International Astronomical Union: Galaxy Interactions at Low and High Redshift, ed. J. E. Barnes & D. B. Sanders (Dordrecht: Springer)
- Shen, S., Mo, H. J., White, S. D. M., et al. 2003, MNRAS, 343, 978
- Shimazaki, H., & Shinomoto, S. 2007, neco, 19, 1503
- Shimwell, T. W., Röttgering, H. J. A., Best, P. N., et al. 2017, A&A, 598, A104
- Shimwell, T. W., Tasse, C., Hardcastle, M. J., et al. 2019, A&A, 622, A1
- Sparke, L. S., & Gallagher, J. S., III 2007, Galaxies in the Universe: An Introduction (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
- Stahler, S. W., & Palla, F. 2004, The Formation of Stars (New York: Wiley)
- Strateva, I., Ivezić, Ž., Knapp, G. R., et al. 2001, AJ, 122, 1861
- Tadhunter, C. 2007, NewAR, 51, 153
- Tajik, Z., Javaherian, M., Daei, F., et al. 2023, AdSpR, 72, 1884
- Tang, H., Scaife, A. M. M., & Leahy, J. P. 2019, MNRAS, 488, 3358
- Taylor, G. B., Readhead, A. C. S., & Pearson, T. J. 1996a, ApJ, 463, 95
- Taylor, G. B., Vermeulen, R. C., Readhead, A. C. S., et al. 1996b, ApJS, 107, 37
- Taylor, M. B. 2005, in ASP Conf. Ser. 347, Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XIV, ed. P. Shopbell, M. Britton, & R. Ebert (San Francisco, CA: ASP), 29
- Tremaine, S., Gebhardt, K., Bender, R., et al. 2002, ApJ, 574, 740
- van Haarlem, M. P., Wise, M. W., Gunst, A. W., et al. 2013, A&A, 556, A2
- Vikhlinin, A., Kravtsov, A., Forman, W., et al. 2006, ApJ, 640, 691
- Williams, W. L., Hardcastle, M. J., Best, P. N., et al. 2019, A&A, 622, A2
- Wolter, A., Caccianiga, A., della Ceca, R., & Maccacaro, T. 1994, ApJ, 433, 29
- York, D. G., Adelman, J., Anderson, J. E. J., et al. 2000, AJ, 120, 1579
- Yousefzadeh, M., Javaherian, M., & Safari, H. 2015, IJAA, 2, 69
- Yuan, F., & Narayan, R. 2014, ARA&A, 52, 529

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.