SEAMLESS Survey: Four Faint Dwarf Galaxies Tracing Low-Mass Galaxy Evolution Across Environments

Catherine E. Fielder , Michael G. Jones , 1,2 David J. Sand , 1 Denija Crnojević , 3
Burçin Mutlu-Pakdil , 4 Paul Bennet , 5 Amandine Doliva-Dolinsky , 6 Richard Donnerstein , 1
Laura Congreve Hunter , 4 Ananthan Karunakaran , 7,8 Donghyeon J. Khim , 1 Deepthi S. Prabhu , 1
Kristine Spekkens , 9, and Dennis Zaritsky , 10

¹Steward Observatory, University of Arizona, 933 North Cherry Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85721-0065, USA
 ²IPAC, Mail Code 100-22, Caltech, 1200 E. California Blvd., Pasadena, CA 91125, USA
 ³Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tampa, 401 West Kennedy Boulevard, Tampa, FL 33606, USA
 ⁴Department of Physics and Astronomy, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA
 ⁵Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA
 ⁶Department of Physics, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, UK
 ⁷Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 3H4, Canada
 ⁸Dunlap Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Toronto, Toronto ON, M5S 3H4, Canada
 ⁹Department of Physics, Engineering Physics and Astronomy, Queen's University, Kingston, ON K7L 3N6, Canada

ABSTRACT

We report on four Local Volume dwarf galaxies identified through our ongoing SEmi-Automated Machine LEarning Search for Semi-resolved galaxies (SEAMLESS): Hydrus A, LEDA 486718, Cetus B, and Sculptor 26, with the discovery of Hydrus A reported here for the first time. These four galaxies span a wide range of environments and evolutionary states. Hydrus A ($M_V = -9.39 \pm 0.20$, D = $3.38^{+0.32}_{-0.30}$ Mpc) and LEDA 486718 ($M_V = -11.62 \pm 0.08$, D = 4.80 ± 0.17 Mpc) are among the most isolated dwarfs known within 5 Mpc, while Cetus B ($M_V = -8.26 \pm 0.17$, D = $3.32^{+0.25}_{-0.23}$ Mpc) and Sculptor 26 ($M_V = -11.25 \pm 0.10$, D = 3.21 ± 0.13 Mpc) lie < $2R_{\rm vir}$ of NGC 253. Hydrus A shows properties consistent with quenching driven by cosmic reionization, cosmic-web interactions, or internal feedback. LEDA 486718 is an isolated star forming dwarf. Cetus B appears quenched and morphologically disturbed, making it a low-mass satellite or backsplash candidate, while Sculptor 26 is red and seemingly gas-poor but displays signs of recent activity, consistent with a transitional evolutionary state. Together, these systems demonstrate the power of SEAMLESS for building a census of faint galaxies beyond the Local Group.

Keywords: Dwarf galaxies (416); Galaxy stellar content (621); Galaxy environments (2029); Galaxy distances (590)

1. INTRODUCTION

The lowest mass galaxies $(M_* \lesssim 10^{6-7} M_{\odot})$ provide stringent tests of galaxy formation physics (e.g., Bullock & Boylan-Kolchin 2017; Sales et al. 2022). Much of what we know about dwarf galaxy evolution has come from the Local Group, whose satellites provide unparalleled detail with deep photometric and spectroscopic studies of kinematics and chemistry (e.g., Weisz et al.

Corresponding author: Catherine E. Fielder fielder.catherine@gmail.com

2014; Brown et al. 2014; Weisz et al. 2015; Skillman et al. 2017; Garrison-Kimmel et al. 2019; Nadler et al. 2021; Akins et al. 2021; Applebaum et al. 2021; Manwadkar & Kravtsov 2022; Santos-Santos et al. 2024; Durbin et al. 2025; Doliva-Dolinsky et al. 2025). Yet, this same detail comes at the cost of cosmic context: the Local Group represents a single, environmentally dense pair of massive host galaxies, and may not capture the diversity of dwarf galaxy evolution in the broader Universe.

The Local Group environment has significant impacts on dwarf galaxies after infall (e.g., Spekkens et al. 2014; Putman et al. 2021). The range of environmental processes Local Group dwarfs may experience includes tidal interactions and ram-pressure stripping, which can remove gas and truncate star formation (e.g., Mayer et al. 2006; Slater & Bell 2013; Wetzel et al. 2015; Akins et al. 2021; Samuel et al. 2022; Pathak et al. 2025). Regardless of environment, faint dwarf galaxies also experience the effects of cosmic reionization (by which the least luminous are likely entirely quenched; e.g., Brown et al. 2014; Rodriguez Wimberly et al. 2019) and internal feedback processes such as those caused by supernovae (e.g., Dekel & Silk 1986; Mac Low & Ferrara 1999; Rev et al. 2020). All of these effects in combination have produced the star formation histories observed among Local Group satellites, making it difficult to disentangle environmental processing from other effects. Studies of dwarfs in other Milky Way-mass environments suggest that the Local Group is not typical: both the abundance and quenching of satellites vary substantially across hosts of similar mass (e.g., Smercina et al. 2018; Bennet et al. 2019; Carlsten et al. 2022; Karunakaran et al. 2021; Greene et al. 2023; Karunakaran et al. 2023; Geha et al. 2024; Jones et al. 2024a; Mao et al. 2024). This highlights the need to characterize dwarf galaxies beyond the Local Group — both in isolation, where environmental effects are minimal, and in group environments — in order to capture the full range of evolutionary pathways experienced by low-mass galaxies.

Identification of dwarf galaxies beyond the Local Group does not come easily, as they are inherently faint targets $(M_V > -12)$ with low surface brightnesses. Until recently, there were only a few known isolated low mass galaxies outside of the Local Group, where dedicated searches were still coming up short (e.g., Sand et al. 2015b; Tollerud & Peek 2018). The challenge of weeding out contaminants from genuine dwarf-galaxy candidates using parameter-based cuts has necessitated the adoption of machine-learning approaches to build a broader sample of faint dwarfs outside the Local Group. Our search is specifically designed to identify semiresolved galaxies: low-mass targets where the brightest stars appear as point sources, in combination with diffuse light from unresolved stars. Semi-resolved targets are likely situated between $\approx 1.5-4$ Mpc, based on the tip of the red giant branch standard candle magnitude of $M_r = -3.0$ mag (Sand et al. 2014). The SEAMLESS (SEmi-Automated Machine LEarning Search for Semiresolved galaxies) survey, first presented in Jones et al. (2023), has revealed numerous nearby, low-mass galaxy candidates in Data Release 10 of the DESI Legacy Imaging Surveys (Dey et al. 2019). This has already resulted in the discoveries of three isolated dwarf galaxies: Pavo (Jones et al. 2023), Corvus A (Jones et al. 2024b), and Kamino (Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025).

In this work, we present deep ground-based followup observations of four additional dwarf galaxies identified in SEAMLESS: Hydrus A, Cetus B, Sculptor 26, and LEDA 486718. These systems were selected because they are among the highest-confidence detections in our search. Of this sample, Hydrus A is newly identified in this work. Cetus B was first reported in the southern SMUDGes (Systematically Mapping Ultra Diffuse Galaxies; Zaritsky et al. 2022) catalog as SMDG0040349-203322 and presented in the Martinez-Delgado et al. (2024) search for possible Sculptor group satellites as Do VIII. Sculptor 26 was first identified in Cote et al. (1997) as a potential dwarf galaxy within the Sculptor group, and as a potential low surface brightness dwarf in Karachentsev et al. (2000) (as [KKS2000] 02). It is also identified in the LEDA database as LEDA 3097692. LEDA 486718 was identified in the LEDA database and as a dwarf galaxy (AM0316-484) in Arp & Madore (1987). Although several of the galaxies studied in this work were previously identified, there was no reliable indication of their distances and thus their physical properties. The goal of this work is to establish accurate distances, global physical properties, and environmental contexts for each sys-

In Section 2 we discuss the SEAMLESS identification and follow-up deep imaging of these galaxies using the Gemini, Magellan, and Swift facilities. In Section 3 we present distance and physical property measurements. In Section 4 we discuss these properties in relation to plausible histories of the galaxies. Last, we summarize and conclude in Section 5.

2. OBSERVATIONAL DATA AND REDUCTION

Hydrus A, Cetus B, Sculptor 26, and LEDA 486718 were identified in our machine learning aided search for semi-resolved galaxies in the publicly available DR10 of the DESI Legacy surveys (Dey et al. 2019), which includes the Dark Energy Camera Legacy Survey (DECaLS), the Mayall z-band Legacy Survey (MzLS), and the Beijing–Arizona Sky Survey (BASS). We refer to this program as SEAMLESS, where a discussion of the technique is presented in Jones et al. (2023). Here we briefly summarize.

The SEAMLESS approach to identifying galaxies starts with the SMUDGes pipeline (Zaritsky et al. 2019, 2023, 2025). High surface brightness stars and bright galaxies are masked and replaced with characteristic noise. Then the images are filtered on a variety of scales in order to enable detection of faint, extended sources. Several criteria (Jones et al. 2023) and cuts based on GALFIT (Peng et al. 2002, 2010) source parameter val-

ues are applied in order to mitigate the number of spurious sources. Candidates are then further refined with a convolutional neural network (CNN) classifier. This is the same CNN utilized by SMUDGes, re-trained to identify resolved and semi-resolved low mass galaxies $(D \lesssim 4 \text{ Mpc given the DECaLS depth})$ and to reject cirrus and background galaxies. Sources with a > 90%probability of being resolved or semi-resolved undergo visual inspection by the team in order to identify the most promising candidates for follow-up. A few dozen of the highest-confidence candidates are currently undergoing follow-up observations, with four being the focus of this work. These systems are robustly identified in SEAMLESS as high-priority targets, and their diversity in appearance and environment is scientifically interesting, highlighting the breadth of objects our method can uncover. Given the large time demand of follow-up observations, several different facilities have been used in this work.

2.1. Magellan Megacam

Deep optical follow-up imaging of Hydrus A and Cetus B was obtained with the Megacam imager (McLeod et al. 2015) on the Magellan Clay telescope. Megacam has a $\approx 24' \times 24'$ field of view and a 0.16 arcsec/pixel binned pixel scale. Observations were acquired on the nights of December 10 (Cetus B; 0.7" seeing) and 11 (Hydrus A; 0.85" seeing), 2023 (part of 2023B-ARIZONA-1; PI: C. Fielder). Images were taken in the g and r bands, with 14×300 s exposures in g and 12×300 s exposures in r for Hydrus A in $\approx 0.85''$ seeing and 8×300 s exposures in each filter for Cetus B in $\approx 0.7''$ seeing. Small dithers were taken between the exposures.

The Megacam data is reduced with the Megacam pipeline at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, which was developed by M. Conroy, J. Roll, and B. McLeod. The reduction includes bias subtraction, flat field corrections, detrending the data, astrometric corrections, and stacking individual dithered frames. After the initial data reduction point-spread function (PSF) fitting photometry is performed on the final stacked images using the DAOPHOT and ALLFRAME software (Stetson 1987, 1994) using the procedure of Mutlu-Pakdil et al. (2021). Non-point source objects are removed from the catalogs as outliers in the parameter spaces of χ^2 versus magnitude, magnitude error versus magnitude, and sharpness versus magnitude. For point sources that pass these cuts, the instrumental magnitudes are then calibrated to the DECaLS DR10 catalog. These calibrated catalogs then are corrected for Galactic extinction using the Schlegel et al. (1998)

reddening maps with the Schlafly & Finkbeiner (2011) coefficients. Extinction-corrected magnitudes are used throughout this work.

To determine photometric error and completeness as a function of magnitude and color we perform artificial star tests with the ADDSTAR routine in DAOPHOT. Artificial stars are placed into the images on a regular grid spaced 10 - 20 times the image FWHM, following the procedure of Mutlu-Pakdil et al. (2018); Sand et al. (2012). These fake stars are assigned r magnitudes randomly drawn from 18 to 29 mag (favoring fainter stars) and g magnitudes set by a uniform (g-r) color distribution between -0.5 and 1.5. Ten iterations are performed per field, yielding $\sim 100,000$ stars total. Photometry is derived in the same way as the unaltered image stacks with the same stellar selection criteria applied allowing determination of both the completeness and magnitude uncertainties. The 50% (90%) completeness for Hydrus A is r = 26.64 (25.57) and g = 26.59 (26.21) mag. The 50% (90%) completeness for Cetus B is r = 26.59(25.62) and g = 27.05 (26.36) mag.

2.2. Gemini GMOS

Deep optical follow-up imaging of Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718 was obtained with the Gemini South telescope using the Gemini Multi-Object Spectrograph (GMOS; Hook et al. 2004). GMOS has an $\approx 5.5' \times 5.5'$ field of view and a 0.16 arcsec/pixel binned pixel scale (the same as Megacam). We obtained g- and r-band imaging under the Fast Turnaround program GS-2024B-FT-208 (PI: M. Jones). LEDA 486718 was observed on November 25 and December 23, 2024, and Sculptor 26 on January 1, 2025. Both galaxies were observed with seven 300-s exposures in each filter. Again, small dithers were taken between the exposures.

We perform initial GMOS data reduction with the DRAGONS pipeline (Labrie et al. 2023a,b). Our DRAGONS reduction includes bias subtraction, flat-field corrections, bad pixel masking, cosmic ray rejection with the sigma-clipping method, and stacking of the individual dithered frames (weighted average). Then astrometric corrections are applied using SCAMP (Bertin 2006). PSF fitting photometry, Galactic extinction corrections, artificial star tests and photometric error/completeness calculations are then performed in the same manner as that of the Megacam images. The 50% (90%) completeness for Sculptor 26 is r=26.80 (25.86) and g=27.30 (26.39) mag. The 50% (90%) completeness for LEDA 486718 is r=27.05 (26.21) and g=27.60 (26.56) mag.




Figure 1. Top row: Magellan/Megacam g+r color images of Hydrus A (upper left) and Cetus B (upper right). Bottom row: Gemini/GMOS g+r color images of Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718. All images are oriented such that north is up and east is left. These galaxies are dominated by red stellar populations, with LEDA 486718 containing some central, blue star formation. It is also evident that Cetus B and Sculptor 26 have somewhat elongated morphologies.

All targets in this work lie within the footprint of the GALEX All-Sky Imaging Survey, with the exception of Sculptor 26. To complement this and measure star formations rates in the recent past ($\approx 100-200$ Myr) for Sculptor 26 we obtained UV imaging with the Ultraviolet/Optical Telescope (UVOT; Roming et al. 2005) on the NASA Neil Gehrels Swift Observatory (Gehrels et al. 2004) in the UVM2 band, which is the most similar to the GALEX NUV band (Hoversten et al. 2009). Sculptor 26 was observed on October 10, 2025 with an exposure time of 1281 s. It is clearly detected in UVM2 (see Appendix A). Our star formation rate calculation

is described in Section 3.4 with the results presented in Table 1.

3. GALAXY PROPERTIES

3.1. Color and Morphology

Our sample, Hydrus A, Cetus B, Sculptor 26, and LEDA 486718, appears to be fairly red in the public DESI Legacy imaging. This is confirmed by our own deep imaging (see Figure 1) and photometric analysis in Section 3.3 (see the (g-r) row in Table 1). Integrated colors and morphologies are commonly used as a surrogate for dwarf galaxy stellar populations, with "early-type" dwarfs typically being red, smooth, and

Table 1. Prop	erties of H	vdrus A.	Cetus B	. Sculptor	26. and	I LEDA	486718
---------------	-------------	----------	---------	------------	---------	--------	--------

Parameter	Hydrus A	Cetus B	Sculptor 26	LEDA 486718	
R.A. (J2000)	03:44:46.40	00:40:34.90	00:40:14.62	03:17:38.18	
Dec. (J2000)	-70:21:15.80	-20:33:25.60	-17:49:33.28	-48:30:23.69	
$m_{r,TRGB} \text{ (mag)}$	24.64 ± 0.07	24.59 ± 0.12	24.52 ± 0.07	.07 25.40 ± 0.05	
m-M (mag)	27.65 ± 0.20	27.60 ± 0.16	27.53 ± 0.09	28.41 ± 0.08	
Distance (Mpc)	$3.38^{+0.32}_{-0.30}$	$3.32^{+0.25}_{-0.23}$	3.21 ± 0.13	4.80 ± 0.17	
$m_g \text{ (mag)}$	18.66 ± 0.02	19.68 ± 0.04	16.61 ± 0.03	17.05 ± 0.01	
$m_r \; (\mathrm{mag})$	17.98 ± 0.05	19.11 ± 0.04	16.05 ± 0.02	16.61 ± 0.02	
(g-r) (mag)	0.68 ± 0.05	0.57 ± 0.06	0.56 ± 0.04	0.44 ± 0.02	
$M_V \text{ (mag)}$	-9.39 ± 0.20	-8.26 ± 0.17	-11.25 ± 0.10	-11.62 ± 0.08	
$\log L_V \; (L_{\odot})$	5.69 ± 0.08	5.24 ± 0.07	6.43 ± 0.04	6.58 ± 0.03	
r_h (arcsec)	11.52 ± 1.2	12.72 ± 0.37	17.99 ± 0.27	12.14 ± 0.14	
r_h (pc)	188^{+26}_{-25}	205_{-15}^{+17}	279 ± 12	282 ± 11	
ϵ	0.15 ± 0.03	0.47 ± 0.02	0.32 ± 0.02	0.20 ± 0.02	
θ (deg)	0.0	10.83 ± 0.59	-3.95 ± 2.79	18.74 ± 0.67	
$\log{\rm (SFR_{\rm NUV}/M_{\odot}yr^{-1})}$	< -4.3	< -4.6	-3.37 ± 0.13	-3.74 ± 0.03	
$\log{\rm (SFR_{FUV}/M_{\odot}yr^{-1})}$	< -4.3	< -4.8		-4.02 ± 0.10	
$\log M_*/{ m M}_{\odot}$	6.0 ± 0.1	5.4 ± 0.1	6.6 ± 0.1	6.5 ± 0.1	
$\log M_{ m H{\scriptscriptstyle I}}/{ m M}_{\odot}$	< 6.27	< 6.17	< 6.11	< 6.58	

Conversions from SDSS filter band to Johnson-Cousins V-band is facilitated by the Jordi et al. (2006) photometric conversions. r_h is the semi-major axis of the ellipse containing half the total integrated light, not a circularized radius. The physical quantities (r_h, ϵ, θ) are derived from both the g and r-bands, where we quote the average between the two. Errors are calculated as the standard deviation between the two quantities. Magnitudes are calculated within $2 \times r_h$. Stellar masses are derived from mass-to-light ratios. See text for details on calculations.

symmetric, indicative of quenched star formation (e.g., Carlsten et al. 2021; Greene et al. 2023). This description broadly applies to our systems, although our deeper imaging reveals that LEDA 486718 has some resolved stars blueward of the red giant branch in the galaxy's outskirts, and hosts a small concentration of bright, blue stars near its center - though the central region is partially unresolved due to crowding. Overall, the sample remains more regular than the recently star-forming dwarfs in the SEAMLESS survey (e.g., Pavo, Corvus A, and Kamino; Jones et al. 2023, 2024b; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025) and more similar in appearance to quenched field dwarfs such as Tucana B (Sand et al. 2022) and other typical dwarf spheroidals.

In addition to the global colors and morphologies, our deep imaging resolves individual stars in each galaxy (Figure 2), allowing us to examine their stellar populations directly. In all four systems we clearly detect red giant branch (RGB) stars, though in some cases only in the lower-density outskirts where crowding is minimal. Only Cetus B does not suffer from notable central crowding. For LEDA 486718, crowding prevents us from resolving the central blue stars seen in the imaging, but we resolve RGB stars at larger radii, as well as a small set of bluer stars. Sculptor 26 may suffer similarly, but the presence of central young blue stars is

less clear in the imaging. Hydrus A suffers from both central crowding and contains a prominent foreground Milky Way main sequence that intersects its RGB, although this only slightly complicates the interpretation of its CMD (see next).

3.2. Distance

Distances are derived using the tip of the red giant branch (TRGB) method (Da Costa & Armandroff 1990; Lee et al. 1993; Makarov et al. 2006). With this approach the sharp break at the bright end of the old RGB population of stars is used as a standard candle. The inner regions of all of the dwarf galaxies except for Cetus B suffer from varying degrees of crowding due to high stellar densities. As a result we manually construct circular annuli where the inner radius is set outside of where crowding is significant and the outer radius is set to two times our calculated half light radius (see Section 3.3 for calculations). We then visually inspect the stars included in our annular selection and exclude obvious contaminants (e.g., very bright stars in the foreground and shredded galaxies masquerading as point sources in the background). These cuts allow us to produce clear colormagnitude diagrams (CMDs), presented in Figure 2, in order to measure the TRGB.




Figure 2. Each set of 3 panels depicts the CMD of each galaxy. In each panel the dotted line marks the 90% completeness limit and the dashed line indicates the 50% completeness limit. The error bars on the left indicate the typical photometric uncertainties in bins of 0.5 mag in r-band. Left: The CMD of stars selected within a circular aperture of the galaxy, where obvious contaminants are excluded (foreground Milky Way stars and background galaxies). Middle: CMD of background stars in the full field of view. Right: Binned, background-subtracted CMD. This is performed by first binning both the galaxy CMD and full background CMD. Then the binned background CMD is scaled to cover the same area as the CMD of the galaxy before the scaled background CMD is then subtracted from the galaxy CMD. In all instances the galaxy CMD clearly separates from the background CMD. Overlaid in each panel is a 10 Gyr, [Fe/H]=-2.5 Dartmouth isochrone (Dotter et al. 2008) in red, set at the TRGB distance (Table 1) of the respective galaxy.

We follow the procedure of Crnojević et al. (2019) for deriving TRGB distances, which we briefly summarize. The photometric uncertainty, bias, and completeness function are determined from our artificial star tests. They are then modeled by continuous functions and convolved with a model luminosity function. The resulting luminosity function is then fit via a nonlinear least-squares algorithm to the RGB of each galaxy's CMD. The TRGB values are based on the r-band cali-

bration of $M_r^{\rm TRGB} = -3.01 \pm 0.01$ derived by Sand et al. (2014). Our derived TRGB values, distance moduli, and distances are reported in Table 1. The distances to all of our targets are between 3 and 5 Mpc (including uncertainties). Over-plotted in each panel of Figure 2 is an old (10 Gyr), metal-poor Dartmouth isochrone (Dotter et al. 2008), shifted to the derived TRGB distances. We have not attempted to assess metallicities, so the isochrones are an arbitrary old age.

Given the sparse population of the RGB for Hydrus A and the Milky Way foreground main sequence (seen in the "background" panel for Hydrus A) that directly intersects our RGB, this distance measurement is the most tenuous. To evaluate whether the Milky Way main sequence could bias the derived distance to smaller values (so a slightly brighter TRGB magnitude), we conducted a simple test. We first estimated the expected number of foreground stars within the RGB selection region by scaling the number of stars in the background (> $3 \times r_h$ beyond the galaxy) by the relative on-sky area, yielding ≈ 4 expected contaminants. We then simulated the effect of these contaminants by randomly removing four stars from the Hydrus A RGB region, repeating this process 1000 times. For each of the 1000 realizations, we performed background subtraction and refit the old, metal-poor Dartmouth isochrones, varying the distance modulus from 27 to 28 mag in 0.01 mag increments. Across these simulations, the recovered distance modulus shifts by up to 0.16 mag fainter relative to our fiducial measurement, consistent with the hypothesis that Milky Way foreground stars can bias the derived distance to smaller values. We interpret the 0.16 mag shift as the scale of the uncertainty introduced by foreground contamination, not as a fixed correction. Because this represents an additional uncorrelated uncertainty, we combine it in quadrature with the statistical TRGB uncertainty (0.12 mag), resulting in a final adopted distance modulus of 27.65 ± 0.20 mag.

3.3. Photometry and Structural Parameters

Because each galaxy is semi-resolved, and there is crowding in the central regions, we take an approach based off of that of Jones et al. (2024b) to measure the structural parameters of our targets. The structural parameters of each of the four dwarf galaxies are measured in the same way, which we describe below.

With the coadded images, we visually inspect to identify the approximate center, axis ratio, and position angle of each target by manually constructing an ellipse that aligns with the visible boundaries of the galaxy. Then sources that fall outside of the manually defined elliptical region around the galaxy are detected using the photutils segmentation algorithm with a 3σ threshold. This created a mask to exclude foreground stars, background galaxies, and any other contaminants that might influence our measurements. Additional contaminating sources within the galaxy aperture are manually masked. To account for the spatial variance of the sky, we estimate the background using Background2D in photutils with a median filter and the source mask. The back-

ground is then subtracted (note that variation across the background is quite small after data reduction).

To measure structural parameters we then smooth the images of Hydrus A and Cetus B with a Gaussian kernel ($\sigma = 2$) in order to aid in the detection of the low surface brightness edges of these galaxies. Smoothing is not necessary for Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718. The segmentation algorithm is rerun to isolate the galaxy and measure ellipticity (ϵ ; Table 1) and position angle $(\theta; \text{ Table 1})$. We then construct concentric elliptical annuli centered on the galaxy, using the derived physical parameters. The integrated flux is measured within each successive aperture to create a cumulative light profile. Integrated flux is measured at the point that the profile reaches the sky level, and the half-light radius $(r_h; \text{ Table 1})$ is measured as the semi-major axis of the ellipse containing half of the integrated light. Integrated magnitudes are derived from the total flux within the cumulative light profile, converted to magnitudes through our derived photometric zero points, and corrected for Galactic extinction using the Schlafly & Finkbeiner (2011) reddening maps.

Uncertainties on the flux in each band were derived empirically, accounting for both background noise and the uncertainty in the half-light radius. To quantify uncertainty associated with background noise, we randomly place a set of "empty" apertures (300) across the image. Each aperture was identical in size and shape to the aperture used for the galaxy flux measurement (an elliptical aperture with semi-major axis $2 \times r_h$), but positioned randomly in regions free of bright sources, beyond $3 \times r_h$ from the target, and away from the image edges. The fluxes measured within these apertures provide an estimate of the background noise contribution, where the standard deviation represents the corresponding flux uncertainty for an aperture area equivalent to those used to calculate our galaxy photometry.

The uncertainty on the half-light radius was estimated by using a procedure parallel to the background-noise test described above. For each elliptical annulus that contributes to the cumulative light profile, we first quantified the uncertainty in the enclosed flux due to background fluctuations. To do this, we randomly placed background apertures whose areas matched the area of that annulus, and used the standard deviation of their fluxes as the flux uncertainty at that radial step. We then propagated these flux uncertainties into an uncertainty on the half-light radius using a Monte Carlo approach: for each realization, the cumulative light profile was perturbed by drawing flux values for each annulus from Gaussian distributions centered on the measured fluxes with widths set by their corresponding uncertain-

ties. The half-light radius was then recomputed for every realization. The standard deviation of the resulting distribution of half-light radii represents the uncertainty in r_h , capturing the impact of measurement noise and background variability on the derived size.

The total flux uncertainty is converted to magnitudes using $\sigma_{m,\text{flux}} = \frac{2.5}{\ln 10} \frac{\sigma_{F,\text{total}}}{F}$. Lastly we incorporate the calibration uncertainty from the photometric zero point by adding it in quadrature.

The same masking, background subtraction, shape measurement, surface brightness profile fitting, and integrated light analysis were repeated for both r- and g-band images. In Table 1, the values presented for ellipticity, position angle, and half light radius, and their corresponding errors are presented as the mean and standard error between the individual photometric band measurements.

We compare our results to the DECaLS imaging measurements for Cetus B from Martinez-Delgado et al. (2024). The position angle that Martinez-Delgado et al. (2024) measured, derived instead using GALFIT (Peng et al. 2002, 2010), is consistent with our measurement to within the error. We find a slightly rounder ellipticity (0.47 \pm 0.02) than their 0.64 \pm 0.01, but both results are fairly elliptical. Our derived half light radii are smaller and hence our derived magnitudes are slightly fainter (0.3-0.4 mag), but overall the results are not significantly different. Further calculations performed by Martinez-Delgado et al. (2024) assumed a distance of 3.7 Mpc for Cetus B whereas we derive a closer distance of $3.32_{-0.23}^{+0.25}$.

In Figure 3 we plot our sample on the size-luminosity relation compared to dwarfs in the Local Group utilizing the Local Volume Database¹ (Pace 2024) and a selection of other notable dwarfs in the Local Volume. Overplotted are lines of constant surface brightness assuming an exponential profile (Sérsic index n=1) for surface brightness values 24, 26, 28, 30, 32 from bottom to top. All of the dwarfs in our sample lie within the scatter of the relation, but are on the higher surface brightness end, especially Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718. However, as mentioned in Jones et al. (2024b), this is likely in part the result of observational bias since high surface brightness dwarfs are easier to identify, especially outside of the Local Group. Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718, which contain tracers of recent star formation (see Section 3.4), also have correspondingly higher surface brightnesses than Hydrus A and Cetus B, which have no evidence of recent star formation.

3.4. Star Formation Rates

Star formation rates (SFRs) for Hydrus A, Cetus B, and LEDA 486718 are derived from the near ultraviolet (NUV) and far ultraviolet (FUV) data within the GALEX all-sky survey (Martin & GALEX Team 2005). While LEDA 486718 has a clear detection in the UV, Hydrus A and Cetus B do not, so we derive upper limits on their star formation rates. Sculptor 26 lies just outside the GALEX footprint, so we acquired Swift UVOT data to derive a SFR. Derived quantities are reported in Table 1.

We perform aperture photometry on the GALEX NUV and FUV tiles using the same process as Jones et al. (2022). We used elliptical apertures defined by twice the galaxy's half-light radius along the major axis (our r_h is measured along the major axis, not circularized) and the measured axis ratio, matching the apertures adopted for the optical photometry. Bright foreground sources and image artifacts are masked, and background noise uncertainties are estimated empirically by randomly placing 10,000 empty apertures across each GALEX tile, matched in area to the science aperture and restricted to regions free of extremely bright sources. Fluxes are converted to AB magnitudes using the calibrations of Morrissey et al. (2007), and corrected for Milky Way extinction adopting $R_{\text{NUV}} = 8.20$ and $R_{\rm FUV} = 8.24$ from Wyder et al. (2007). De-reddened flux densities are then converted to luminosities using our measured distances to each galaxy. SFRs are calculated following the procedure of Iglesias-Páramo et al. (2006), adopting a bolometric absolute magnitude of the Sun of 4.74.

Swift UVM2 photometry is derived much in the same way as our optical and GALEX photometry. Note that GALEX NUV and Swift UVM2 have very similar central wavelengths (e.g. Cook et al. 2025). Count rates within the aperture are converted to AB magnitudes using the Swift UVM2 calibration zero point² of 18.54, and then to flux densities including compensating for UVOT's sensitivity loss. The observed magnitude and flux density is corrected for Milky Way extinction with $R_{UVM2} = 6.99$ (Yi et al. 2023). Our measured magnitude for Sculptor 26 is $m_{UVM2} = 18.1$. SFRs are then calculated following the procedure of Iglesias-Páramo et al. (2006) as before.

The CMDs for our sample (Figure 2) are dominated by red, evolved stars, reflecting the fact that they probe the less crowded outer regions where the stellar populations are uniformly old. Despite this, both Sculptor 26

¹ https://github.com/apace7/local_volume_database

 $^{^2}$ https://swift.gsfc.nasa.gov/analysis/uvot_digest/zeropts.html




Figure 3. Size-luminosity relation of Local Volume dwarfs, with Hydrus A, Cetus B, Sculptor 26, and LEDA 486718 depicted with large red symbols. Diagonal dotted lines show constant surface brightness assuming an exponential profile (24, 26, 28, 30, 32 mag arcsec⁻² from bottom to top). Grey points are sourced from the Local Volume Database (Pace 2024). Other noteworthy Local Volume dwarfs are also highlighted (Irwin et al. 2007; McConnachie 2012; Giovanelli et al. 2013; McQuinn et al. 2015; Sand et al. 2015a, 2022, 2024; Bennet et al. 2022; Jones et al. 2023, 2024b; Li et al. 2024; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025).

and LEDA 486718 have detectable star formation, suggesting the presence of younger stars concentrated in the central regions where crowding limits our CMD sensitivity. The NUV is most sensitive to star formation that occurred within the past ≈ 100 Myr, and FUV can be sensitive to even younger stars (e.g., Lee et al. 2009, 2011). For Hydrus A, Cetus B, and LEDA 486718, the star formation rates/limits are comparable in the NUV and FUV, meaning that the mean star formation likely has not varied substantially in the past ~ 100 Myr. Other isolated low-mass dwarfs with extant star formation rates such as Leo P ($\log (SFR/M_{\odot}yr^{-1}) = -4.4$, $\log(\text{sSFR}) = -10.1$; McQuinn et al. 2015), Corvus A $(\log (SFR/M_{\odot}yr^{-1}) = -3.25 \pm 0.07, \log (sSFR) = -9.5;$ Jones et al. 2024b), and Pavo $(\log (SFR/M_{\odot}yr^{-1}) =$ $-4.0^{+0.3}_{-0.8}$, $\log(\text{sSFR}) = -10.8$; Jones et al. 2023) have comparable measured SFRs and specific star formation rates (sSFR = SFR/ M_*) to Sculptor 26 (log(sSFR) = -10.0) and LEDA 486718 (log(sSFR) = -10.2). We note that Leo P, Pavo, and Corvus A are a few times lower in mass than Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718.

3.5. Stellar Mass and H I Mass

We estimate the stellar masses of the four dwarf galaxies using their (g-r) colors, integrated magnitudes, and the mass-to-light ratio relations of Zibetti et al. (2009) and Into & Portinari (2013), adopting the mean of the two methods for each system. The resulting stellar masses span a range of $5.4 \leq \log(M_*/\mathrm{M}_\odot) \lesssim 6.6$ (Table 1). Sculptor 26 is the most massive galaxy in the sample $(\log(M_*/\mathrm{M}_\odot) = 6.6 \pm 0.1)$, closely followed by LEDA 486718 $(\log(M_*/\mathrm{M}_\odot) = 6.5 \pm 0.1)$; both are com-

parable to the isolated dwarf Kamino (log(M_*/M_\odot) = $6.50^{+0.15}-0.11$; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025). Hydrus A is less massive (log(M_*/M_\odot) = 6.0 ± 0.1), consistent with isolated dwarfs such as Hedgehog (log(M_*/M_\odot) = 5.8 ± 0.2 ; Li et al. 2024) and Pavo (log(M_*/M_\odot) = $6.08^{+0.14}_{-0.04}$; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025). Cetus B is by far the lowest-mass system in our sample (log(M_*/M_\odot) = 5.4 ± 0.1), similar to the extremely low-mass star-forming dwarf Leo P (log(M_*/M_\odot) = $5.43^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$; McQuinn et al. 2024), although Leo P's mass is derived from a very deep CMD rather than a global color scaling relation.

We also use the derived NUV star formation rates to obtain independent, order-of-magnitude stellar mass estimates for Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718, assuming a constant SFR over a Hubble time ($\approx 1.3 \times 10^{10}$ yr). This yields $\log(M_*/\mathrm{M}_\odot) = 6.8 \pm 0.1$ for Sculptor 26 and $\log(M_*/\mathrm{M}_\odot) = 6.4 \pm 0.1$ for LEDA 486718 - both consistent with the mass-to-light–based results within their uncertainties.

We estimate upper limits on the H I content of our targets using spectra from the H I Parkes All Sky Survey (HIPASS; Barnes et al. 2001) spectral server. We do not identify any significant emission peaks that may correspond to the neutral gas content of any of our targets. This does not completely rule out the possibility that neutral gas exists in these targets, since the HIPASS data is not particularly deep, but for now we estimate upper limits for the H I masses of these systems. We assume that the dwarf radial velocities are sufficiently high enough to not be blended with the H I emission of the Milky Way. To address Milky Way contamination we apply cuts to the H I spectra. The spectrum

for Hydrus A is the most contaminated by the Milky Way where we apply a cut $-100 < cz_{\odot} < 400$. For Cetus B we cut $-200 < cz_{\odot} < 100$. For Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718 we cut $-100 < cz_{\odot} < 100$. These latter cuts are still well away from the circular velocity of NGC 253 ($\approx 261~\rm km\,s^{-1}$; Westmeier et al. 2017), which Cetus B and Sculptor 26 are near. The spectra are Hanning smoothed, with an rms noise of 8.1 mJy at a velocity resolution of 13 km s⁻¹(27 km s⁻¹ post smoothing). We then calculate the 3σ integrated flux limit assuming a line width of 25 km s⁻¹ for a dwarf-galaxy H I line (Leo P's H I velocity width is 24 km s⁻¹; Giovanelli et al. 2013). Our values are reported in the last row of Table 1.

Comparing our H I mass limits to other known low-mass galaxies, we would generally expect to be able to detect gas reservoirs on par with that of Corvus A ($\log M_{\rm H\,{\sc i}}/M_{\odot}=6.55\pm0.06$; Jones et al. 2024b, Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025), but we would be unable to detect those of either Leo P ($\log M_{\rm H\,{\sc i}}/M_{\odot}=5.91$; Giovanelli et al. 2013, McQuinn et al. 2024) or Pavo ($\log M_{\rm H\,{\sc i}}/M_{\odot}=5.79$; Jones et al. 2025). Also, because of the distance to our four targets, the H I limits are several times worse than for the quenched low-mass galaxy, Tucana B ($\log M_{\rm H\,{\sc i}}/M_{\odot}<5.6$; Sand et al. 2022). This in turn means that only Sculptor 26 can be said to be gas-poor (i.e., $M_{\rm H\,{\sc i}}/M_{\ast}<1$) with confidence.

3.6. Environment

In Figure 4 we plot the super-galactic Cartesian XY and YZ projection of galaxies within the Local Volume (< 5 Mpc) centered on the Milky Way. The galaxy catalog of Karachentsev & Kaisina (2019) is plotted in gray, with notable groups labeled.

Our sample can be evenly split between those that are isolated and those that are plausibly associated with a group. Hydrus A and LEDA 486718 do not fall within the local sheet and are isolated. Using the Karachentsev & Kaisina (2019) catalog, the nearest galaxy to Hydrus A is KK 27, 902 kpc away (in 3D distance), measured via TRGB with HST in Karachentsev et al. (2003a). For reference, the closest group to Hydrus A is NGC 300, 2.2 Mpc away. The nearest galaxy to LEDA 486718 is NGC 1311, 821 kpc away, measured via TRGB with HST in Jacobs et al. (2009). The closest group to LEDA 486718 is NGC 253, 2.9 Mpc away. In comparison, even the most isolated faint dwarfs fall in close proximity to the local sheet, except for Kamino (nearest neighbor 947 kpc away; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025) and GALFAdw4 (nearest neighbor 2.2 Mpc away: Bennet et al. 2022). Therefore, in addition to Kamino and GALFAdw4, Hydrus A and LEDA 486718 are some

of the most isolated dwarf galaxies in the Local Volume that also fall outside of the local sheet.

In contrast, Cetus B and Sculptor 26 lie in proximity to the Sculptor filamentary structure and consequently the NGC 253 group. In Figure 5 we plot Cetus B and Sculptor 26 alongside confirmed members of the NGC 253 group. Note that in this projection Cetus B $(D = 3.32^{+0.25}_{-0.23} \text{ Mpc})$ and Sculptor 26 are in the foreground (D = 3.21 ± 0.13 Mpc) compared to NGC 253 (D $=3.5\pm0.1$ Mpc; Radburn-Smith et al. 2011), NGC 247 (D = 3.72 ± 0.03 Mpc; Jacobs et al. 2009; Westmeier et al. 2017) and even DDO6 (D = $3.44^{+0.13}_{-0.15}$ Mpc; Anand et al. 2021). The closest galaxy to Cetus B is DDO6, with a 3D separation of only 177 kpc measured via TRGB with HST (Karachentsev et al. 2003b). The closest galaxy to Sculptor 26 is Cetus B, separated by 190 kpc. In relation to the dominant members of the Sculptor group Cetus B is 347 kpc away from NGC 253, and Sculptor 26 is 533 kpc from NGC 253. Assuming NGC 253 has a virial radius of approximately 330 kpc (Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2021), Cetus B is very close to the virial boundary (and falls within the virial radius when accounting for errors on this distance), with Sculptor 26 a bit further out. NGC 247 is a plausible sub-group of NGC 253, with a virial radius of 120 kpc (Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2021, 2024). Cetus B lies 410 kpc from NGC 247 while Sculptor 26 lies 550 kpc away.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Hydrus A

Hydrus A is an isolated dwarf galaxy $3.38^{+0.32}_{-0.30}$ Mpc away, with a stellar mass of $M_*=10^{6.04\pm0.03}\,\mathrm{M}_\odot$. It is the smallest galaxy in this sample $(r_h=188^{+26}_{-25}\,\mathrm{pc})$, but remains consistent with the size–luminosity relation for Local Volume dwarfs (Figure 3). In physical parameter space Hydrus A is strikingly similar to Hedgehog $(M_*=10^{5.8\pm0.2}\,\mathrm{M}_\odot,\,M_V=-9.84\pm0.16,\,r_h=176\pm14$; Li et al. 2024), and nearly as isolated. NGC 300 is the nearest group to Hydrus A, $\sim18R_\mathrm{vir}$ away (Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2021).

Hydrus A shows no sign of recent star formation. There is no UV emission to signal traces of star formation within the past ≈ 100 Myr, no detected H I (although this constraint is weak), and its red optical color $((g-r)=0.68\pm0.05)$ is consistent with an exclusively old stellar population. While Hydrus A suffers from central crowding (<9''), there is no evidence that there is a significant population of younger stars at the center given the red color and lack of UV detection. Its morphology is smooth and featureless, without evidence for tidal disturbances, and contains no dust lanes or similar features. Together, these properties indicate that




Figure 4. Supergalactic XY (left) and YZ (right) projections of objects in the nearby galaxy catalog (Karachentsev & Kaisina 2019). In the XY plane we label notable nearby galaxy groups. Hydrus A, Cetus B, Sculptor 26, and LEDA 486718 are marked with red points. Other notable nearby dwarf galaxies are included for comparison. Hydrus A and LEDA 486718 are isolated, while Cetus B and Sculpture 26 are in the periphery of the NGC 253 group.

Hydrus A is quenched. Given Hydrus A's extreme isolation, external environmental processes associated with massive hosts (e.g., ram-pressure stripping or tidal harassment) are not likely explanations for its quenched appearance. Instead, field-quenching mechanisms (e.g., filaments), cosmic quenching mechanisms (e.g., reionization), or internal quenching processes (e.g., feedback) may explain the observed properties of Hydrus A.

Hydrus A is low enough in mass that it falls close to the anticipated mass threshold at which galaxies are effected by cosmic reionization. Reionization is expected to be the likely cause of quenching for field dwarfs $\lesssim 10^6 \rm M_{\odot}$ (e.g., Babul & Rees 1992; Bullock et al. 2001; Benson et al. 2002; Ricotti & Gnedin 2005; Weisz et al. 2014). Very low mass galaxies are expected to be highly susceptible to gas evaporation (e.g., Shapiro et al. 2004; Wheeler et al. 2015) and suppression of gas cooling and accretion due to the UV background from reionization (e.g., Okamoto et al. 2008; Katz et al. 2020). In this scenario, Hydrus A formed its stars early and failed to subsequently accrete or retain cool gas.

In the field filaments may also ram pressure strip the gas within a dwarf galaxy (Benítez-Llambay et al. 2013; Simpson et al. 2018; Benavides et al. 2025). However, it is unclear how large of a role this mechanism plays in the quenching of field dwarfs. Given how isolated Hydrus A is, far from the local sheet structure (see Figure 4), Hy-

drus A would have had to pass through such a structure at much earlier times.

Internal quenching mechanisms may also be a driver in how Hydrus A looks today. Low-mass dwarf galaxies are more susceptible to the feedback effects of star formation and supernovae. While star formation feedback is thought to not be capable of completely quenching a dwarf galaxy, supernova feedback may be strong enough to expel most of the gas within a dwarf galaxy, especially if working in tandem with cosmic reionization (e.g., Salvadori & Ferrara 2009; Benítez-Llambay et al. 2015; Jeon et al. 2017; Rey et al. 2020). For example, Gallart et al. (2021) finds that nearby ultrafaint dwarf Eridanus II $(M_* = 10^{5.05} \mathrm{M}_{\odot})$ could be quenched by supernova feedback alone. Distinguishing internal feedback from reionization in Hydrus A requires a detailed star-formation history derived from deep spacebased optical and infra-red photometry. In the former case star formation would be expected to rapidly cease > 12 Gyr ago, while in the latter case a more protracted SFH would be expected, potentially extending several Gyrs after the end of reionization.

A backsplash origin is technically possible, a scenario in which Hydrus A formerly traversed a larger halo and was ejected to its current location. However, the absence of a candidate host make this scenario improbable and we can likely exclude an ancient flyby with NGC 300 given their large separation. Following the




Figure 5. Known dwarf galaxies in proximity to NGC 253. The dashed black and gray circles mark the virial radii of NGC 253 and NGC 247 respectively. The sample includes dwarfs from the PISCeS survey (Sand et al. 2014; Toloba et al. 2016; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2022), and dwarfs discovered by Martínez-Delgado et al. (2021) (DoIII and DoIV) and Carlsten et al. (2022) (dw0036m2828) with associations confirmed in Mutlu-Pakdil et al. (2024). Cetus B and Sculptor 26 are marked with red points. In this projection Cetus B appears to lie within the virial radius of both NGC 253 and NGC 247. Cetus B is within the foreground of both objects, but accounting for uncertainties on the distance may fall within the virial radius of NGC 247. Sculptor 26 is also in the foreground and within neither virial boundary.

logic of Li et al. (2024) if we assume an ejection velocity of $\sqrt{2}v_{circ}$ and a maximum circular velocity for NGC 300 of $\sim 100~\rm km\,s^{-1}$ (Westmeier et al. 2011), it would take $\sim 22~\rm Gyr$ to reach its current location, or longer than the age of the Universe. This is further supported by recent simulation work (e.g., Benavides et al. 2025) that shows that only $\sim 6\%$ of quenched field dwarfs are expected to be true backsplash systems under stringent isolation criteria. Therefore, for Hydrus A we favor a quenching mechanism that involves either early reionization/feedback-driven gas loss, or removal of gas via a filament/void encounter rather than a classical satellite-host interaction.

4.2. LEDA 486718

LEDA 486718 is an isolated dwarf galaxy 4.80 \pm 0.17 Mpc away, with a stellar mass of $M_*=10^{6.53\pm0.06}~\rm M_{\odot}$. LEDA 486718 is isolated, and over $\sim 8.8R_{\rm vir}$ from the nearest group, NGC 253. Such sep-

arations strongly disfavor a recent interaction with another galaxy.

LEDA 486718 is the largest $(r_h=282\pm11~{\rm pc};$ only slightly larger than Sculptor 26) and the brightest galaxy in our sample $(M_V=-11.62\pm0.08)$. While it falls within the expectation of the size-luminosity relation, it is on the high surface brightness end. In this physical parameter space both LEDA 486718 and Sculptor 26 are very similar to Corvus A $(M_*=10^{6.20^{+0.15}_{-0.07}}~{\rm M}_{\odot},$ $M_V=-10.91\pm0.10,$ $r_h=292\pm16$ pc; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025), but are redder in appearance.

UV emission indicates star formation within the past ≈ 100 Myr for LEDA 486718, consistent with its blue color $((g-r) = 0.44 \pm 0.02)$; the bluest in our sample). The central region appears to have bright blue stars that are not fully represented in our CMD due to central crowding, but are plausibly the site of recent star formation. LEDA 486718 is redder than Corvus A or Pavo (both (g - r) = 0.3; Jones et al. 2023, 2024b), but the CMD of LEDA 486718 still clearly displays both an old RGB sequence and some bluer, younger stars. While less prominent than in Corvus A, Pavo, or Leo P (see ground-based CMD in McQuinn et al. 2013), LEDA 486718 is the only galaxy in our sample with an identifiable younger stellar population distinct from background contaminants (see Figure 2). This young component, combined with measurable UV SFR, suggests that LEDA 486718 has experienced star formation in the past ~ 100 Myr.

Unlike the isolated star-forming dwarf Leo P, LEDA 486718 does not have a detected H I reservoir. The non-detection could indicate that (1) the remaining gas is below current sensitivity limits of the HIPASS survey, (2) the H I could overlap with the Milky Way ($-100 < cz_{\odot} < 100$), (3) the gas is predominantly ionized, or (4) the recent star-formation episode exhausted or expelled the neutral gas component. Such low or absent H I content in otherwise star-forming (until recently) dwarfs has been noted in other isolated systems, for example Pavo (Jones et al. 2023, 2025).

Standard galaxy formation theory suggests that low-mass dwarfs commonly form stars in bursty, intermittent episodes driven by internal feedback through star formation (10-100 Myr timescales, e.g., Hopkins et al. 2014; Fitts et al. 2017; Emami et al. 2019) or supernovae (> 100 Myr timescales, e.g., Stinson et al. 2007; Bland-Hawthorn et al. 2015; Wheeler et al. 2019; Hirai et al. 2024). In either scenario gas is disrupted and heated, typically flowing out into a hot halo where it cools until star formation is able to continue. Observational (e.g., Giovanelli & Haynes 2015) and theoretical works (Rey et al. 2020, 2022) suggest that the very low

mass, star forming galaxies may even periodically become invisible to H I surveys due to these feedback processes (assuming the H I is not detectable with deeper observations). LEDA 486718 may be undergoing such a cycle, where the gas reservoir is low-mass, difficult to detect at HIPASS sensitivity, and intermittently converted into stars.

The combination of isolation and clear evidence of recent star formation suggests that LEDA 486718 is an example of a low-mass field dwarf with either low level star formation, or internally regulated, intermittent star formation. Deeper H_I observations and photometric observations to measure the star formation history are necessary.

4.3. Cetus B

Cetus B is a very low mass $M_*=10^{5.40\pm0.04}~{\rm M}_{\odot}$, quenched dwarf galaxy, located $3.32^{+0.25}_{-0.23}$ Mpc away. Cetus B is the faintest ($M_V=-8.26\pm0.17$) and least massive galaxy in our sample. In terms of targets outside of the Local Group, Cetus B is the most similar to Sculptor B, a quenched galaxy which may plausibly be an extreme backsplash galaxy of NGC 300 (Sand et al. 2024).

Cetus B has no tracers of star formation in the past ≈ 100 Myr in the UV and a red stellar population ($(g-r)=0.57\pm0.06$). These properties suggest that Cetus B contains a predominantly old stellar population and its star formation has quenched, but we note that the H I limits are insufficient to draw conclusions about gas in the system. Cetus B has no dust lanes or detectable star-forming regions, and appears elongated in the north-east southwest directions.

Cetus B is not isolated, $\sim 1.1 R_{\rm vir}$ from NGC 253, and $\sim 3.4 R_{\rm vir}$ from NGC 247 (Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2021) Cetus B is in the foreground of the projection plotted in Figure 5, but including error on the distance we measure to Cetus B, it may be within the virial radius of NGC 253.

Given Cetus B's proximity to NGC 253, coupled with elongated morphology suggestive of environmental processing, Cetus B is a satellite/backsplash candidate of the Sculptor group. In the backsplash picture, Cetus B would have passed within the virial radius of NGC 253 (or possibly NGC 247), where environmental processing - e.g. ram-pressure stripping or tidal interactions - could have substantially removed its gas supply and perturbed its stellar structure (e.g. Slater & Bell 2014; Simpson et al. 2018). If Cetus B is a satellite of the system (and may very well be, since within error is $<1R_{\rm vir}$ from NGC 253) then this process may be ongoing.

Cetus B may also have experienced a variety of other processes (e.g., cosmic filament interactions, reionization, internal feedback, see Hydrus A discussion) and is only coincidentally near the Sculptor group, but its close proximity to NGC 253 and distorted morphology are suggestive of a backsplash/satellite candidate (although the major axis of Cetus B does not point towards NGC 253). Deep kinematics, gas-sensitivity-limited observations, and orbital modeling will ultimately be required to distinguish these evolutionary histories.

4.4. Sculptor 26

Sculptor 26 is a star-forming dwarf galaxy located at $D=3.21\pm0.13$ Mpc in the direction of the Sculptor filament, with a stellar mass of $10^{6.58\pm0.04}$ M $_{\odot}$, the most massive in our sample. In size and luminosity Sculptor 26 is fairly high surface brightness, closely resembling the isolated star-forming dwarfs LEDA 486718 and Corvus A (Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025; Jones et al. 2024b).

Like LEDA 486718, Sculptor 26 shows UV emission indicative of star formation within the past ≈ 100 Myr. The CMD of Sculptor 26 lacks an obvious young main-sequence component, although we may be missing some due to central crowding. Its morphology is smooth, without clear dust lanes or knotty star-forming regions. Together, these properties point to a system at the boundary between actively star forming and quenched.

Sculptor 26 does not have a detected H_I reservoir. However, unlike the rest of the sample, the H_I limit is below the stellar mass estimate, so we can infer that even if H_I is present then Sculptor 26 is gas poor $(M_{\rm H\,I}/M_* < 1)$. As we mention for LEDA 486718 the gas could just be below the sensitivity limit of HIPASS, overlap with the Milky Way in its spectrum, be predominantly ionized, or the H_I may have been recently exhausted. Group infall provides a fifth pathway: Sculptor 26 may be experiencing gas removal via tidal or rampressure interactions.

Sculptor 26 is not isolated, $\sim 1.6R_{\rm vir}$ from NGC 253 and $\sim 4.6R_{\rm vir}$ from NGC 247 (Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2021). Although in the foreground relative to NGC 253, Sculptor 26's position lies in the regime where association with the group is plausible (Fillingham et al. 2018; Simpson et al. 2018).

While Sculptor 26 is a backsplash candidate of the Sculptor group at this radius, its relatively regular morphology and nonzero recent star formation make a backsplash origin less compelling, as backsplash dwarfs are typically more strongly processed (Slater & Bell 2014; Fillingham et al. 2015; Wetzel et al. 2015; Fillingham et al. 2019). A simpler explanation is that Sculptor 26 is on first infall into the NGC 253 system and is beginning

to experience environmental suppression (gas stripping takes a few Gyr after infall to MW-mass hosts). Alternatively, Sculptor 26 could be like LEDA 486718, with the UV flux reflecting either continuous or intermittent star formation. The proximity to NGC 253 leads us to favor early group processing as an explanation for Sculptor 26's current appearance, but fully distinguishing between these scenarios requires deeper H I measurements, kinematic measurements to determine group association, and resolved space-based photometric star formation history measurements.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The environmental diversity and properties of these four systems provides an opportunity to assess how isolation and group association influence the properties of low-mass galaxies beyond the Local Group. Hydrus A and LEDA 486718, which lie outside the local sheet, are currently among the most isolated dwarfs known in the Local Volume, while Cetus B and Sculptor 26 occupy the periphery of the Sculptor filament and may be associated with the NGC 253 group. Hydrus A and Cetus B appear to be quenched, while Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718 harbor evidence of star formation in the past ~100 Myr. None of these targets have H I detections in the HIPASS survey; the H I constraints on Sculptor 26 are strong enough for us to infer that it is gas poor.

Our sample is low mass $(M_* \lesssim 10^7, M_{\odot})$, below the mass threshold where nearly all isolated dwarfs are expected to be star forming (Geha et al. 2012). At this mass scale the quenched fraction of isolated galaxies rises to $\sim 15-20\%$ in simulations (Christensen et al. 2024). Thus, the presence of both star-forming and quenched dwarfs in isolated environments is not unexpected. Hydrus A's low stellar mass, compact structure, red stellar population, lack of indicators of recent star formation, and extreme isolation (nearest neighbor ~ 900 kpc) make it a candidate for quenching by reionization, the cosmic web, or self-regulating internal feedback. Conversely, LEDA 486718, with recent star formation, may represent a low-mass dwarf with either continued and steady star formation, or intermittent, and possibly bursty star formation.

The other half of our sample lies plausibly within the dynamical reach of the NGC 253 group, with both Cetus B and Sculptor 26 located at $\lesssim 2R_{\rm vir}$ of NGC 253. Yet these two systems are distinct. Cetus B is a faint, low-mass, morphologically disturbed galaxy, with its proximity to the Sculptor group making it a backsplash or satellite candidate. If confirmed as a backsplash system, it would be among the lowest-mass backsplash system,

tems known, comparable to Sculptor B near NGC 300, and would serve as a valuable case study of environmental transformation around a Milky-Way-like system. Sculptor 26, by contrast, appears to be an intermediate-state dwarf: currently forming stars but red, plausibly gas poor. Its properties place it between isolated star-forming dwarfs and backsplash satellites, consistent with early-stage environmental transformation.

Overall, these four galaxies illustrate that low-mass dwarfs outside the Local Group occupy a wide range of evolutionary states. Their gas content, recent star-formation histories, and morphological properties do not correlate in a simple way with environment. Instead, the sample supports a picture in which quenching mechanisms at low mass are diverse: internal regulation may dominate in some isolated systems; reionization or the cosmic web may suppress star formation in the most weakly bound halos; and environmentally driven processes — ram pressure stripping or tidal heating or stripping — operate near massive hosts.

Future observations are needed to clarify the evolutionary histories of these systems. Deep HI observations would determine whether weak gas reservoirs exist, potentially revealing ongoing environmentally driven stripping or re-accretion. Systemic velocities will be critical for determining whether Cetus B and Sculptor 26 are bound to NGC 253, thereby constraining their orbital histories and backsplash likelihoods. Space-based imaging with HST or JWST to the oldest main sequence turn off would yield detailed star-formation histories, differentiating early quenching (e.g., by reionization) from more recent environmental or internal shutdown (e.g., Weisz et al. 2019; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025). Such data would also resolve whether LEDA 486718 has experienced bursty star formation (like Leo P) or more steady low-level activity (as was revealed for Pavo). Together, these observations would place strong constraints on the dominance of internal versus environmental quenching channels in the lowest-mass galaxies.

To date, SEAMLESS has identified dozens of strong dwarf–galaxy candidates across the Local Volume and has now delivered detailed follow-up characterization for seven systems (see Jones et al. 2023, 2024b; Mutlu-Pakdil et al. 2025). The four galaxies presented here highlight the survey's ability to uncover both extremely isolated dwarfs and systems at the edges of group environments, populations that have been historically underrepresented in census studies. SEAMLESS will provide an unprecedented, machine-learning–enabled map of the low-mass galaxy population within 5 Mpc. Many of these additional candidates will require vetting with deeper imaging: roughly half appear to lie beyond

5 Mpc and instead resemble the SHIELD galaxies (Survey of HI in Low-mass Dwarfs; Cannon et al. 2011). These 'beyond-Local Volume' systems illustrate both the power of SEAMLESS to identify low-mass galaxies and the need for careful distance confirmation. The resulting statistical sample — paired with targeted followup spectroscopy, HI mapping, and space-based imaging will enable transformative tests of low-mass galaxy formation, quenching pathways, and environmental processing outside the Local Group.

This paper includes data gathered with the 6.5 meter Magellan Telescopes located at Las Campanas Observa-2 tory, Chile.

Based on observations obtained at the international Gemini Observatory (under Fast Turnaround program GS-2024B-FT-208), a program of NSF NOIRLab, which is managed by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the U.S. National Science Foundation on behalf of the Gemini Observatory partnership: the 10 U.S. National Science Foundation (United States), Na-11 tional Research Council (Canada), Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo (Chile), Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación (Argentina), Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia, Inovações e Comunicações (Brazil), 15 and Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute (Republic of Korea).

13

14

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

31

This work used images from the Dark Energy Camera Legacy Survey (DECaLS; Proposal ID 2014B-0404; PIs: David Schlegel and Arjun Dey). Full acknowledgment is at https://www.legacysurvey.org/acknowledgment/.

We acknowledge the use of public data from the Swift data archive.

BMPacknowledges support from NSF AST2508745. DJS & DZ acknowledge support from NSF grants AST-2508746. DC acknowledges support from NSF grant AST-2508747. DZ and RD acknowledge support from NSF AST-2006785 and NASA ADAP 80NSSC23K0471 for their work on the SMUDGes pipeline. KS acknowledges support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

Facilities: Magellan/Megacam, Gemini/GMOS, Swift/UVOT, GALEX

Software: Astropy (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013, 2018, 2022), Numpy (Harris et al. 2020), Scipy (Virtanen et al. 2020; Gommers et al. 2025), Pandas (pandas development team 2024), Photutils (Bradley et al. 2022), DS9 (Joye & Mandel 2003), GALFIT (Peng et al. 2002, 2010), daophot and allframe (Stetson 1987, 1994), SCAMP (Bertin 2006), DRAGONS (Labrie et al. 2023a,b)

APPENDIX

A. UV DETECTIONS

In this section we present the UV images of Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718. Sculptor 26 is constructed from the UVM2 data we acquired through Swift, as described in Section 2.3. LEDA 486718 is constructed from archival GALEX all sky imaging survey data (Martin & GALEX Team 2005).




Figure 6. Left: Swift UVM2 image of Sculptor 26. Right: GALEX NUV image of LEDA 486718. Both images are oriented such that north is up and east is left. The dashed ellipses mark $2\times$ the optical half light radius of the respective galaxy, where the semi major axis is $2\times r_h$ in Table 1 and the remaining properties of the ellipse come from the ellipticity ϵ and position angle θ of the same table. Sculptor 26 and LEDA 486718 are both clearly detected in the UV.

REFERENCES

Akins, H. B., Christensen, C. R., Brooks, A. M., et al. 2021, ApJ, 909, 139, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/abe2ab Anand, G. S., Rizzi, L., Tully, R. B., et al. 2021, AJ, 162, $80, \, doi: \, 10.3847/1538-3881/ac0440$ Applebaum, E., Brooks, A. M., Christensen, C. R., et al. 2021, ApJ, 906, 96, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/abcafa Arp, H. C., & Madore, B. 1987, A catalogue of southern peculiar galaxies and associations Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, A&A, 558, A33, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201322068 Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Sipőcz, B. M., et al. 2018, AJ, 156, 123, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/aabc4f Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Lim, P. L., et al. 2022, apj, 935, 167, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c74 Babul, A., & Rees, M. J. 1992, MNRAS, 255, 346, doi: 10.1093/mnras/255.2.346 Barnes, D. G., Staveley-Smith, L., de Blok, W. J. G., et al. 2001, MNRAS, 322, 486, doi: 10.1046/j.1365-8711.2001.04102.x Benavides, J. A., Navarro, J. F., Sales, L. V., Pérez, I., & Bidaran, B. 2025, ApJ, 985, 86, ${\bf doi:\ } 10.3847/1538\text{-}4357/{\bf adced0}$ Benítez-Llambay, A., Navarro, J. F., Abadi, M. G., et al.

2013, ApJL, 763, L41, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/763/2/L41

—. 2015, MNRAS, 450, 4207, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv925

Bennet, P., Sand, D. J., Crnojević, D., et al. 2019, ApJ, 885, 153, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ab46ab —. 2022, ApJ, 924, 98, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac356c Benson, A. J., Lacey, C. G., Baugh, C. M., Cole, S., & Frenk, C. S. 2002, MNRAS, 333, 156, doi: 10.1046/j.1365-8711.2002.05387.x Bertin, E. 2006, in Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series, Vol. 351, Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XV, ed. C. Gabriel, C. Arviset, D. Ponz, & S. Enrique, 112 Bland-Hawthorn, J., Sutherland, R., & Webster, D. 2015, ApJ, 807, 154, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/807/2/154 Bradley, L., Sipőcz, B., Robitaille, T., et al. 2022, astropy/photutils: 1.5.0, 1.5.0, Zenodo, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.6825092 Brown, T. M., Tumlinson, J., Geha, M., et al. 2014, ApJ, 796, 91, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/796/2/91 Bullock, J. S., & Boylan-Kolchin, M. 2017, ARA&A, 55, 343, doi: 10.1146/annurev-astro-091916-055313 Bullock, J. S., Kolatt, T. S., Sigad, Y., et al. 2001, MNRAS, 321, 559, doi: 10.1046/j.1365-8711.2001.04068.x Cannon, J. M., Giovanelli, R., Haynes, M. P., et al. 2011, ApJL, 739, L22, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/739/1/L22 Carlsten, S. G., Greene, J. E., Beaton, R. L., Danieli, S., & Greco, J. P. 2022, ApJ, 933, 47, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac6fd7

- Carlsten, S. G., Greene, J. E., Greco, J. P., Beaton, R. L., & Kado-Fong, E. 2021, ApJ, 922, 267, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac2581
- Christensen, C. R., Brooks, A. M., Munshi, F., et al. 2024, ApJ, 961, 236, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad0c5a
- Cook, K., Holwerda, B., & Robertson, C. 2025, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2510.02054, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2510.02054
- Cote, S., Freeman, K. C., Carignan, C., & Quinn, P. J. 1997, AJ, 114, 1313, doi: 10.1086/118565
- Crnojević, D., Sand, D. J., Bennet, P., et al. 2019, ApJ, 872, 80, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aafbe7
- Da Costa, G. S., & Armandroff, T. E. 1990, AJ, 100, 162, doi: 10.1086/115500
- Dekel, A., & Silk, J. 1986, ApJ, 303, 39, doi: 10.1086/164050
- Dey, A., Schlegel, D. J., Lang, D., et al. 2019, AJ, 157, 168, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/ab089d
- Doliva-Dolinsky, A., Collins, M. L. M., & Martin, N. F. 2025, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2502.06948, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2502.06948
- Dotter, A., Chaboyer, B., Jevremović, D., et al. 2008, ApJS, 178, 89, doi: 10.1086/589654
- Durbin, M. J., Choi, Y., Savino, A., et al. 2025, ApJ, 992, 106, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ae00c8
- Emami, N., Siana, B., Weisz, D. R., et al. 2019, ApJ, 881, 71, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ab211a
- Fillingham, S. P., Cooper, M. C., Boylan-Kolchin, M., et al. 2018, MNRAS, 477, 4491, doi: 10.1093/mnras/sty958
- Fillingham, S. P., Cooper, M. C., Wheeler, C., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 454, 2039, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv2058
- Fillingham, S. P., Cooper, M. C., Kelley, T., et al. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1906.04180, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1906.04180
- Fitts, A., Boylan-Kolchin, M., Elbert, O. D., et al. 2017, MNRAS, 471, 3547, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stx1757
- Gallart, C., Monelli, M., Ruiz-Lara, T., et al. 2021, ApJ, 909, 192, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/abddbe
- Garrison-Kimmel, S., Wetzel, A., Hopkins, P. F., et al. 2019, MNRAS, 489, 4574, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stz2507
- Geha, M., Blanton, M. R., Yan, R., & Tinker, J. L. 2012, ApJ, 757, 85, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/757/1/85
- Geha, M., Mao, Y.-Y., Wechsler, R. H., et al. 2024, ApJ, 976, 118, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad61e7
- Gehrels, N., Chincarini, G., Giommi, P., et al. 2004, ApJ, 611, 1005, doi: 10.1086/422091
- Giovanelli, R., & Haynes, M. P. 2015, A&A Rv, 24, 1, doi: 10.1007/s00159-015-0085-3
- Giovanelli, R., Haynes, M. P., Adams, E. A. K., et al. 2013, AJ, 146, 15, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/146/1/15

- Gommers, R., Virtanen, P., Haberland, M., et al. 2025, scipy/scipy: SciPy 1.15.0, v1.15.0, Zenodo, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.14593523
- Greene, J. E., Danieli, S., Carlsten, S., et al. 2023, ApJ, 949, 94, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/acc58c
- Harris, C. R., Millman, K. J., van der Walt, S. J., et al. 2020, Nature, 585, 357, doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2
- Hirai, Y., Kirby, E. N., Chiba, M., et al. 2024, ApJ, 970, 105, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad500c
- Hook, I. M., Jørgensen, I., Allington-Smith, J. R., et al. 2004, PASP, 116, 425, doi: 10.1086/383624
- Hopkins, P. F., Kereš, D., Oñorbe, J., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 445, 581, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stu1738
- Hoversten, E. A., Gronwall, C., Vanden Berk, D. E., et al. 2009, ApJ, 705, 1462,
 - doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/705/2/1462
- Iglesias-Páramo, J., Buat, V., Takeuchi, T. T., et al. 2006, ApJS, 164, 38, doi: 10.1086/502628
- Into, T., & Portinari, L. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 2715, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stt071
- Irwin, M. J., Belokurov, V., Evans, N. W., et al. 2007, ApJL, 656, L13, doi: 10.1086/512183
- Jacobs, B. A., Rizzi, L., Tully, R. B., et al. 2009, AJ, 138, 332, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/138/2/332
- Jeon, M., Besla, G., & Bromm, V. 2017, ApJ, 848, 85, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aa8c80
- Jones, M. G., Sand, D. J., Bellazzini, M., et al. 2022, ApJ, 935, 51, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c6c
- Jones, M. G., Mutlu-Pakdil, B., Sand, D. J., et al. 2023, ApJL, 957, L5, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ad0130
- Jones, M. G., Sand, D. J., Karunakaran, A., et al. 2024a, ApJ, 966, 93, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad3076
- Jones, M. G., Sand, D. J., Mutlu-Pakdil, B., et al. 2024b, ApJL, 971, L37, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ad676e
- Jones, M. G., Rey, M. P., Sand, D. J., et al. 2025, ApJ, 990, 164, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/adf6ab
- Jordi, K., Grebel, E. K., & Ammon, K. 2006, A&A, 460, 339, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20066082
- Joye, W. A., & Mandel, E. 2003, in Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series, Vol. 295, Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XII, ed. H. E.
 Payne, R. I. Jedrzejewski, & R. N. Hook, 489
- Karachentsev, I. D., & Kaisina, E. I. 2019, Astrophysical Bulletin, 74, 111, doi: 10.1134/S1990341319020019
- Karachentsev, I. D., Karachentseva, V. E., Suchkov, A. A., & Grebel, E. K. 2000, A&AS, 145, 415, doi: 10.1051/aas:2000249
- Karachentsev, I. D., Makarov, D. I., Sharina, M. E., et al. 2003a, A&A, 398, 479, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20021566

- Karachentsev, I. D., Grebel, E. K., Sharina, M. E., et al. 2003b, A&A, 404, 93, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20030170
- Karunakaran, A., Sand, D. J., Jones, M. G., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 524, 5314, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stad2208
- Karunakaran, A., Spekkens, K., Oman, K. A., et al. 2021, ApJL, 916, L19, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ac0e3a
- Katz, H., Ramsoy, M., Rosdahl, J., et al. 2020, MNRAS, 494, 2200, doi: 10.1093/mnras/staa639
- Labrie, K., Simpson, C., Turner, J., et al. 2023a, DRAGONS, 3.1.0, Zenodo, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.7776065
- Labrie, K., Simpson, C., Cardenes, R., et al. 2023b, Research Notes of the American Astronomical Society, 7, 214, doi: 10.3847/2515-5172/ad0044
- Lee, J. C., Gil de Paz, A., Tremonti, C., et al. 2009, ApJ, 706, 599, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/706/1/599
- Lee, J. C., Gil de Paz, A., Kennicutt, Jr., R. C., et al. 2011, ApJS, 192, 6, doi: 10.1088/0067-0049/192/1/6
- Lee, M. G., Freedman, W. L., & Madore, B. F. 1993, ApJ, 417, 553, doi: 10.1086/173334
- Li, J., Greene, J. E., Carlsten, S. G., & Danieli, S. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2406.00101, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2406.00101
- Mac Low, M.-M., & Ferrara, A. 1999, ApJ, 513, 142, doi: 10.1086/306832
- Makarov, D., Makarova, L., Rizzi, L., et al. 2006, AJ, 132, 2729, doi: 10.1086/508925
- Manwadkar, V., & Kravtsov, A. V. 2022, MNRAS, 516, 3944, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stac2452
- Mao, Y.-Y., Geha, M., Wechsler, R. H., et al. 2024, ApJ, 976, 117, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad64c4
- Martin, C., & GALEX Team. 2005, in Maps of the Cosmos, ed. M. Colless, L. Staveley-Smith, & R. A. Stathakis, Vol. 216, 221, doi: 10.1017/S0074180900196664
- Martinez-Delgado, D., Stein, M., Pawlowski, M. S., et al. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2405.03769, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2405.03769
- Martínez-Delgado, D., Makarov, D., Javanmardi, B., et al. 2021, A&A, 652, A48, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202141242
- Mayer, L., Mastropietro, C., Wadsley, J., Stadel, J., & Moore, B. 2006, MNRAS, 369, 1021,
 doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2006.10403.x
- McConnachie, A. W. 2012, AJ, 144, 4, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/144/1/4
- McLeod, B., Geary, J., Conroy, M., et al. 2015, PASP, 127, 366, doi: 10.1086/680687
- McQuinn, K. B. W., Skillman, E. D., Berg, D., et al. 2013, AJ, 146, 145, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/146/6/145
- McQuinn, K. B. W., Skillman, E. D., Dolphin, A., et al. 2015, ApJ, 812, 158, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/812/2/158

- McQuinn, K. B. W., Newman, M. J. B., Skillman, E. D., et al. 2024, ApJ, 976, 60, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad8158
- Morrissey, P., Conrow, T., Barlow, T. A., et al. 2007, ApJS, 173, 682, doi: 10.1086/520512
- Mutlu-Pakdil, B., Sand, D. J., Carlin, J. L., et al. 2018, ApJ, 863, 25, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aacd0e
- Mutlu-Pakdil, B., Sand, D. J., Crnojević, D., et al. 2021, ApJ, 918, 88, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac0db8
- —. 2022, ApJ, 926, 77, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac4418
- —. 2024, ApJ, 966, 188, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ad36c4
- Mutlu-Pakdil, B., Jones, M. G., Sand, D. J., et al. 2025, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2509.16307, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2509.16307
- Nadler, E. O., Drlica-Wagner, A., Bechtol, K., et al. 2021,PhRvL, 126, 091101,doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.091101
- Okamoto, T., Gao, L., & Theuns, T. 2008, MNRAS, 390, 920, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2008.13830.x
- Pace, A. B. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2411.07424, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2411.07424
- pandas development team, T. 2024, pandas-dev/pandas: Pandas, v2.2.3, Zenodo, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.13819579
- Pathak, D., Christensen, C. R., Brooks, A. M., et al. 2025, ApJ, 989, 178, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/adec94
- Peng, C. Y., Ho, L. C., Impey, C. D., & Rix, H.-W. 2002, AJ, 124, 266, doi: 10.1086/340952
- 2010, AJ, 139, 2097, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/139/6/2097
 Putman, M. E., Zheng, Y., Price-Whelan, A. M., et al.
 2021, ApJ, 913, 53, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/abe391
- Radburn-Smith, D. J., de Jong, R. S., Seth, A. C., et al. 2011, ApJS, 195, 18, doi: 10.1088/0067-0049/195/2/18
- Rey, M. P., Pontzen, A., Agertz, O., et al. 2020, MNRAS, 497, 1508, doi: 10.1093/mnras/staa1640
- —. 2022, MNRAS, 511, 5672, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stac502 Ricotti, M., & Gnedin, N. Y. 2005, ApJ, 629, 259, doi: 10.1086/431415
- Rodriguez Wimberly, M. K., Cooper, M. C., Fillingham, S. P., et al. 2019, MNRAS, 483, 4031, doi: 10.1093/mnras/sty3357
- Roming, P. W. A., Kennedy, T. E., Mason, K. O., et al. 2005, SSRv, 120, 95, doi: 10.1007/s11214-005-5095-4
- Sales, L. V., Wetzel, A., & Fattahi, A. 2022, Nature Astronomy, 6, 897, doi: 10.1038/s41550-022-01689-w
- Salvadori, S., & Ferrara, A. 2009, MNRAS, 395, L6, doi: 10.1111/j.1745-3933.2009.00627.x
- Samuel, J., Wetzel, A., Santistevan, I., et al. 2022, MNRAS, 514, 5276, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stac1706
- Sand, D. J., Spekkens, K., Crnojević, D., et al. 2015a, ApJL, 812, L13, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/812/1/L13

- Sand, D. J., Strader, J., Willman, B., et al. 2012, ApJ, 756, 79. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/756/1/79
- Sand, D. J., Crnojević, D., Strader, J., et al. 2014, ApJL, 793, L7, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/793/1/L7
- Sand, D. J., Crnojević, D., Bennet, P., et al. 2015b, ApJ, 806, 95, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/806/1/95
- Sand, D. J., Mutlu-Pakdil, B., Jones, M. G., et al. 2022, ApJL, 935, L17, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ac85ee
- —. 2024, ApJL, 977, L5, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ad927c
- Santos-Santos, I. M. E., Navarro, J. F., & McConnachie, A. 2024, MNRAS, 532, 2490, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stae1616
- Schlafly, E. F., & Finkbeiner, D. P. 2011, ApJ, 737, 103, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/737/2/103
- Schlegel, D. J., Finkbeiner, D. P., & Davis, M. 1998, ApJ, 500, 525, doi: 10.1086/305772
- Shapiro, P. R., Iliev, I. T., & Raga, A. C. 2004, MNRAS, 348, 753, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.07364.x
- Simpson, C. M., Grand, R. J. J., Gómez, F. A., et al. 2018, MNRAS, 478, 548, doi: 10.1093/mnras/sty774
- Skillman, E. D., Monelli, M., Weisz, D. R., et al. 2017, ApJ, 837, 102, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aa60c5
- Slater, C. T., & Bell, E. F. 2013, ApJ, 773, 17, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/773/1/17
- —. 2014, ApJ, 792, 141, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/792/2/141
- Smercina, A., Bell, E. F., Price, P. A., et al. 2018, ApJ, 863, 152, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aad2d6
- Spekkens, K., Urbancic, N., Mason, B. S., Willman, B., & Aguirre, J. E. 2014, ApJL, 795, L5, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/795/1/L5
- Stetson, P. B. 1987, PASP, 99, 191, doi: 10.1086/131977
- —. 1994, PASP, 106, 250, doi: 10.1086/133378
 Stinson, G. S. Dalcanton, J. J. Quinn, T. Kau
- Stinson, G. S., Dalcanton, J. J., Quinn, T., Kaufmann, T., & Wadsley, J. 2007, ApJ, 667, 170, doi: 10.1086/520504
- Tollerud, E. J., & Peek, J. E. G. 2018, ApJ, 857, 45, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aab3e4
- Toloba, E., Sand, D. J., Spekkens, K., et al. 2016, ApJL, 816, L5, doi: 10.3847/2041-8205/816/1/L5

- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., et al. 2020, Nature Methods, 17, 261, doi: 10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2
- Weisz, D. R., Dolphin, A. E., Skillman, E. D., et al. 2014, ApJ, 789, 147, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/789/2/147
- —. 2015, ApJ, 804, 136, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/804/2/136
- Weisz, D. R., Martin, N. F., Dolphin, A. E., et al. 2019, ApJL, 885, L8, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ab4b52
- Westmeier, T., Braun, R., & Koribalski, B. S. 2011, MNRAS, 410, 2217,
 - doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.17596.x Vestmeier, T., Obreschkow, D., Calabretta, M.
- Westmeier, T., Obreschkow, D., Calabretta, M., et al. 2017, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 472, 4832, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stx2289
- Wetzel, A. R., Tollerud, E. J., & Weisz, D. R. 2015, ApJL, 808, L27, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/808/1/L27
- Wheeler, C., Oñorbe, J., Bullock, J. S., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 453, 1305, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv1691
- Wheeler, C., Hopkins, P. F., Pace, A. B., et al. 2019, MNRAS, 490, 4447, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stz2887
- Wyder, T. K., Martin, D. C., Schiminovich, D., et al. 2007, ApJS, 173, 293, doi: 10.1086/521402
- Yi, F., Haibo, Y., Ruoyi, Z., Jian, G., & Shuai, X. 2023, MNRAS, 525, 2701, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stad2463
- Zaritsky, D., Donnerstein, R., Dey, A., et al. 2023, ApJS, 267, 27, doi: 10.3847/1538-4365/acdd71
- Zaritsky, D., Donnerstein, R., Karunakaran, A., et al. 2022, ApJS, 261, 11, doi: 10.3847/1538-4365/ac6ceb
- Zaritsky, D., Donnerstein, R., & Khim, D. J. 2025, The Open Journal of Astrophysics, 8, 90, doi: 10.33232/001c.142073
- Zaritsky, D., Donnerstein, R., Dey, A., et al. 2019, ApJS, 240, 1, doi: 10.3847/1538-4365/aaefe9
- Zibetti, S., Charlot, S., & Rix, H.-W. 2009, MNRAS, 400, 1181, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15528.x