Review of "How to Measure Galaxy Star Formation Histories II: Nonparametric Models"

Vikrant Gupta
Second-Year (BS–MS), IISER Pune

December 2025

Original paper: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.03637

Overview and Motivation

This paper by Leja et al. and others investigates how galaxy star formation histories (SFHs) are inferred when using nonparametric models in spectral energy distribution (SED) fitting. Physical quantities such as stellar mass, star formation rate (SFR), and stellar age are not directly observable, and must instead be inferred from broadband photometry using population synthesis models. A crucial but often underappreciated aspect of this process is the assumed form of the SFH and, in particular, the prior placed on it.

The main motivation of the paper is to examine whether nonparametric SFH models, which are often assumed to be more flexible and less biased than parametric models, actually lead to more reliable physical inferences. The authors argue that although nonparametric models remove explicit functional assumptions, they remain strongly influenced by the choice of prior. The goal of the paper is to quantify this effect and demonstrate how different priors can lead to qualitatively different interpretations of galaxy evolution.

Parametric SFH Models and Priors

In this work, the authors focus on nonparametric SFHs in which star formation is described by a set of constant SFRs across fixed time bins. While this approach avoids assuming a specific functional form such as an exponential or lognormal SFH, it requires an explicit prior on how stellar mass or SFR is distributed across time.

Several priors are explored, including the log-mass (logM) prior, Dirichlet priors with different concentration parameters, and a continuity prior that enforces smooth changes in SFR between adjacent time bins. Each of these priors corresponds to a different physical picture of galaxy evolution, ranging from highly bursty star formation to smooth, slowly varying histories.

A key point emphasized by the authors is that these priors impose strong and often hidden assumptions on derived quantities such as stellar age, specific SFR, and mass-to-light ratio. Even though the models are formally nonparametric, the prior effectively determines which SFHs are considered plausible before the data are taken into account.

Tests Using Mock Observations

To isolate the influence of the SFH prior, the authors first test their models on mock galaxy photometry generated from known input SFHs. These include smooth histories, rapidly rising or declining SFHs, burst-dominated histories, and quenching scenarios.

The results show that nonparametric models can generally recover broad trends in star formation, such as whether a galaxy is actively forming stars or quenched. However, the detailed shape of the recovered SFH depends strongly on the assumed prior. In many cases, different priors yield very different SFHs while providing equally good fits to the photometry.

Importantly, the authors find that increasing the signal-to-noise ratio does not eliminate this dependence. Even at high S/N, the posterior SFHs remain prior-dominated, especially at early lookback times. This demonstrates that broadband photometry alone does not contain enough information to uniquely constrain galaxy assembly histories.

Application to Observational Data

The paper applies these nonparametric models to UV–IR photometry of over 6000 galaxies from the GAMA survey. Two priors in particular, the logM prior and the continuity prior, are compared in detail.

While both priors fit the observed photometry well, they lead to strikingly different physical interpretations. The logM prior produces highly bursty SFHs and fails to recover a clear star-forming sequence, instead implying rapid transitions between star-forming and quiescent states. In contrast, the continuity prior yields smoother SFHs and recovers a star-forming sequence consistent with previous observational studies.

This result is especially significant because it shows that well-established features such as the star-forming sequence are not guaranteed outcomes of SED fitting, but can instead be artifacts of the assumed SFH prior. The data alone do not require smooth SFHs, nor do they rule out strongly variable ones.

Key Conclusions

The central conclusion of the paper is that nonparametric SFH models are highly sensitive to the choice of prior. Although they avoid the rigid structure of parametric models, they do not provide model-independent reconstructions of galaxy SFHs.

The authors demonstrate that broadband photometry is consistent with radically different galaxy assembly histories depending on the assumed prior. As a result, inferred quantities such as stellar ages, quenching timescales, and star formation variability should be interpreted with caution. The paper strongly argues that priors must be physically motivated, explicitly stated, and carefully considered when comparing results across different studies.

Personal Assessment

This paper provides a clear and convincing analysis of the limitations of SFH recovery from photometric data. A major strength of the work is its systematic exploration of priors and its emphasis on understanding what is constrained by data versus what is imposed by assumptions.

From an undergraduate perspective, the paper is particularly valuable because it highlights how modeling choices can fundamentally shape scientific conclusions. It also motivates the need for higher-quality observational constraints, such as spectroscopy, and closer integration between simulations and observational modeling. Overall, this work encourages a more critical and careful interpretation of inferred galaxy star formation histories.