STRIDES: Spectroscopic and photometric characterization of the environment and effects of mass along the line of sight to the gravitational lenses DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008

E. J. Buckley-Geer $\bigcirc^{1,2\star}$ $\bigcirc^{1,2\star}$ $\bigcirc^{1,2\star}$ H. Lin,^{[1](#page-32-0)} C. E. Rusu \bigcirc^{3} \bigcirc^{3} \bigcirc^{3} J. Poh,^{2[,4](#page-32-3)} A. Palmese \bigcirc^{1} , A. Agnello,⁵ L. Christensen,⁵ J. Frieman, ^{1[,2](#page-32-1)[,4](#page-32-3)} A. J. Shajib $\mathbb{P},^6$ $\mathbb{P},^6$ $\mathbb{P},^6$ $\mathbb{P},^6$ T. Treu, 6 T. Collett $\mathbb{P},^7$ $\mathbb{P},^7$ S. Birrer, 6,8 6,8 6,8 6,8 T. Anguita $\mathbb{P},^{9,10}$ $\mathbb{P},^{9,10}$ $\mathbb{P},^{9,10}$ C. D. Fassnacht, 11 11 11 G. Meylan[,](http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5043-3662)¹² S. Mukherjee ^{([13](#page-32-12)}, [1](#page-32-0)3 K. C. Wong $\overset{\textcircled{\text{D}}}{\bullet}$,^{[14](#page-32-13)} M. Aguena, ^{15[,16](#page-32-15)} S. Allam, ¹ S. Avila $\overset{\textcircled{\text{D}}}{\bullet}$, ^{[17](#page-32-16)} E. Bertin, ^{18[,19](#page-32-18)} S. Bhargava[,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4802-3194) 20 D. Brooks, 21 21 21 A. Carnero Rosell \bullet , 22 22 22 M. Carrasco Kind \bullet , 23,24 23,24 23,24 23,24 J. Carretero, 25 F. J. Castander, ^{[26,](#page-33-5)[27](#page-33-6)} M. Costanzi, ^{28,[29](#page-33-8)} L. N. da Costa, ^{[16](#page-32-15)[,30](#page-33-9)} J. De Vicente ^{(1[,](http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8318-6813)[22](#page-33-1)} S. Desai, ^{3[1](#page-32-0)} H. T. Diehl, ¹ P. Doel,^{[21](#page-33-0)} T. F. Eifler [®][,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1894-3301)^{[32,](#page-33-11)[33](#page-33-12)} S. Everett,³⁴ B. Flaugher,¹ P. Fosalba,^{26,[27](#page-33-6)} J. García-Bellido,¹⁷ E. Gaztanaga^{(\bullet}[,](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3270-7644)^{[26,](#page-33-5)[27](#page-33-6)} D. Gruen \bullet ,^{[35,](#page-33-14)[36,](#page-33-15)[37](#page-33-16)} R. A. Gruendl,^{23,[24](#page-33-3)} J. Gschwend,^{[16](#page-32-15)[,30](#page-33-9)} G. Gutierrez,^{[1](#page-32-0)} S. R. Hinton[®][,](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2071-9349)^{[38](#page-33-17)} K. Honscheid,^{39[,40](#page-33-19)} D. J. James,⁴¹ K. Kuehn,^{[42,](#page-33-21)[43](#page-33-22)} N. Kuropatkin,¹ M. A. G. Maia,^{[16](#page-32-15)[,30](#page-33-9)} J. L. Marshall[,](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2120-1154) ⁴⁴ P. Melchior \mathbb{P} , ^{[45](#page-33-24)} F. Menanteau, ^{[23,](#page-33-2)[24](#page-33-3)} R. Miquel, ^{[46](#page-33-25)[,25](#page-33-4)} R. L. C. Ogando \mathbb{P} , ^{[16](#page-32-15)[,30](#page-33-9)} F. Paz-Chinchón[,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2598-0514) 23,24 23,24 23,24 23,24 A. A. Plazas \mathbb{P} , 45 45 45 E. Sanchez, 22 V. Scarpine, 1 1 M. Schubnell, 47 S. Serrano, 26,27 26,27 26,27 26,27 I. Sevilla-Noarbe[,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7047-9358)²² M. Smith ¹⁹,^{[48](#page-33-27)} M. Soares-Santos ¹⁹, ^{[49](#page-33-28)} E. Suchyta ¹⁹, ^{[50](#page-33-29)} M. E. C. Swanson, ²⁴ G. Tarle, ⁴⁷ D. L. Tucker, $\frac{1}{1}$ and T. N. Varga^{51[,52](#page-33-31)} (The DES Collaboration)

Affiliations are listed at the end of the paper

Accepted 2020 August 17. Received 2020 August 5; in original form 2020 March 25

ABSTRACT

In time-delay cosmography, three of the key ingredients are (1) determining the velocity dispersion of the lensing galaxy, (2) identifying galaxies and groups along the line of sight with sufficient proximity and mass to be included in the mass model, and (3) estimating the external convergence *κ*ext from less massive structures that are not included in the mass model. We present results on all three of these ingredients for two time-delay lensed quad quasar systems, DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 . We use the Gemini, Magellan, and VLT telescopes to obtain spectra to both measure the stellar velocity dispersions of the main lensing galaxies and to identify the line-of-sight galaxies in these systems. Next, we identify 10 groups in DES J0408– 5354 and two groups in WGD 2038–4008 using a group-finding algorithm. We then identify the most significant galaxy and galaxy-group perturbers using the 'flexion shift' criterion. We determine the probability distribution function of the external convergence *κ*ext for both of these systems based on our spectroscopy and on the DES-only multiband wide-field observations. Using weighted galaxy counts, calibrated based on the Millennium Simulation, we find that DES J0408–5354 is located in a significantly underdense environment, leading to a tight (width ∼ 3 per cent), negative-value *κ*ext distribution. On the other hand, WGD 2038–4008 is located in an environment of close to unit density, and its low source redshift results in a much tighter *κ*_{ext} of ∼ 1 per cent, as long as no external shear constraints are imposed.

Key words: gravitational lensing: strong – galaxies: groups: general – quasars: individual: DES J0408–5354 , WGD 2038–4008 .

1 INTRODUCTION

When a source with a time-varying luminosity such as a quasar or a supernova undergoes strong gravitational lensing, the light reaching the observer from the multiple images takes different paths and hence different traveltimes. It was noted by Refsdal [\(1964\)](#page-25-0) that these timedelays between the images can be used to measure cosmological distances and the Hubble constant H_0 . In recent years, the H_0 Lenses in COSMOGRAIL's Wellspring (H0LiCOW) collaboration has been leading an active time-delay cosmography program to measure H_0

using lensed quasars, see Suyu et al. [\(2017\)](#page-25-1), Wong et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-2) and references therein. For a recent review of the field of time-delay cosmography see Treu & Marshall [\(2016\)](#page-25-3). The significant improvements in the uncertainty in the measurements of H_0 in the last two decades have come from the understanding of the key ingredients required to achieve an accurate measurement. In particular, three of these ingredients are: (1) determining the velocity dispersion of the lensing galaxy, (2) identifying galaxies and groups along the line of sight that are close enough to the lens and massive enough to be included in the mass model, and (3) estimating the external convergence κ_{ext} due to less massive structures that are not included explicitly in the mass model. In this work, we present results on these three ingredients for two time-delay lensed quasar systems, DES J0408–5354

(source redshift $z_s = 2.375$, main deflector redshift $z_d = 0.5967$; Lin et al. [2017\)](#page-24-0) and WGD 2038-4008 ($z_s = 0.777$, $z_d = 0.2283$; Agnello et al. [2018\)](#page-24-1), as part of the STRong Lensing Insights into the Dark Energy Survey (STRIDES) campaign (Treu et al. [2018\)](#page-25-4), an external collaboration of the Dark Energy Survey (DES).

It has been known for sometime that including stellar kinematics of the lensing galaxy allows one to break the degeneracies inherent in the mass profile of the lens (Treu & Koopmans [2002\)](#page-25-5). To obtain the stellar velocity dispersion of the lens we took spectroscopic observations of the main lensing galaxy in DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 .

If the perturbers along the line of sight are not explicitly accounted for in the lens modelling, these perturbations can result in systematic errors of order a few per cent in the inferred value of H_0 . To reduce such systematics, we identify galaxies and galaxy groups in the fields of DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 that may significantly impact the lensing potential of the system. These galaxies and galaxy groups will be included in the lens models for both DES J0408–5354 (Shajib et al. [2019,](#page-25-6) Yidirim et al., in preparation) and WGD 2038 − 4008 (Wong et al., in preparation).

To identify the most significant perturbing galaxies and galaxy groups, we use the '*flexion shift*' diagnostic proposed by McCully et al. [\(2014,](#page-24-2) [2017\)](#page-24-3), which has also been used in the line-of-sight analysis of the H0LiCOW lenses HE 0435–1223 (Sluse et al. [2017\)](#page-25-7) and WFI 2033–4723 (Sluse et al. [2019\)](#page-25-8). This diagnostic estimates the difference in lensed image positions caused by the leading order non-tidal (i.e. third-order) perturbation produced by a nearby galaxy or galaxy group. McCully et al. [\(2017\)](#page-24-3) showed that by explicitly modelling perturbers with flexion shifts larger than the conservative limit of $\Delta_3 x > 10^{-4}$ arcsec, we can constrain the bias on H_0 due to this uncertainty to the per cent level.

In addition, we determine for both systems the probability distribution function of the external convergence κ_{ext} due to less massive structures, which do not need to be explicitly incorporated in the mass modelling, but none the less contribute a uniform mass sheet. Indeed, if unaccounted for, this quantity would bias H_0 such that $H_0 = H_0^{\text{model}}(1 - \kappa_{\text{ext}})$ (e.g. Suyu et al. [2010a\)](#page-25-9), for H_0^{model} obtained from lens modelling. For the first time, we determine *κ*ext based on multiband (*griz*), wide-field images obtained from the $(DES)^1$ data. Following previous work (Fassnacht, Koopmans & Wong [2011;](#page-24-4) Greene et al. [2013;](#page-24-5) Rusu et al. [2017;](#page-25-10) Birrer et al. [2019;](#page-24-6) Chen et al. [2019;](#page-24-7) Rusu et al. [2019\)](#page-25-11), we measure the under/overdensity of the line of sight towards both lens systems relative to the 'average' line-of-sight density throughout the Universe, obtained from the cosmologically representative sample provided by the DES in the form of a set of control fields. Aiming to constrain *κ*ext as tightly as possible, as well as to study the effect of different analysis choices, we determine under/overdensities using various combinations of weighting schemes for the galaxy counts, such as the radial distance to the lens/field centre and the redshift. Finally, we convert the measured under/overdensities into a κ_{ext} distribution, using ray-tracing through the Millennium Simulation (MS; Springel et al. [2005\)](#page-25-12). We explore several aperture sizes, and two different photometric redshift algorithms, which we further test through simulations.

We perform a spectroscopic survey to obtain redshifts of galaxies in the fields of DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 . This redshift data are used to identify galaxy groups located in the environment or along the line of sight to these strong lensing systems as well as in

[1https://www.darkenergysurvey.org](https://www.darkenergysurvey.org)

the calculation of the under/overdensity of the line of sight towards both lens systems.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we describe our photometric and spectroscopic data, and in Section 3, we present our techniques to measure redshifts and stellar masses. In Section 4, we derive the stellar velocity dispersions for the main lensing galaxies in the two systems, and in Section 5, we describe our technique to identify galaxy groups. In Section 6, we identify the structures which can potentially affect the modelling of the lensing systems. In Section 7, we present our measurement of the relative weighted galaxy count ratios for DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 , including accounting for relevant errors. In Section 8, we use raytracing through the MS in order to obtain $P(\kappa_{ext})$ for the measured ratios, and present our tests for robustness. Finally, we conclude in Section 9.

This work represents one of a series of papers from the STRIDES collaboration, which together aim to obtain an accurate and precise estimate of H_0 with a blinded approach, from a comprehensive modelling of DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 . In particular, lens modelling is performed by two independent modelling teams (Shajib et al. [2019,](#page-25-6) as well as Yildirim et al., in preparation, Wong et al., in preparation), both of which make use of the stellar velocity dispersion, environment, and line-of-sight constraints derived in this work. Throughout this paper, we assume a flat Λ CDM cosmology with $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$ for convenience when estimating physical individual galaxy and galaxy group properties (Sections 5–6). However, in the latter part of the analysis, where we determine the under/overdensities of the fields of the lenses and then derive κ_{ext} distributions using ray-tracing through the MS, we adopt the MS cosmology, $\Omega_m = 0.25$, $\Omega_{\lambda} = 0.75$, $h = 0.73$, $\sigma_8 = 0.9$ for consistency. This is not expected to have a significant effect on the inference of H_0 (see Section 8). We present all magnitudes in the AB system. We define all standard deviations as the semidifference between the 84th and 16th percentiles.

2 DATA

The DES is a deep sky survey that was carried out using the Dark Energy Camera (DECam; Flaugher et al. [2015\)](#page-24-8) located on the Blanco 4 m telescope at the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory in the Chilean Andes. The survey ran from 2013 to 2019 (Diehl et al. [2019\)](#page-24-9) and covered \sim 5100 deg² of the southern sky in five optical filters (*grizY*). The DES data are processed by the DES Data Management team (DESDM; Morganson et al. [2018\)](#page-24-10) to produce annual data releases that consist of coadded images and object catalogues. We have used two data sets for the work described here, the first year of DES data which is referred to as DES Year 1 (Y1) and the first three years known as DES Year 3 (Y3). The median single epoch PSF full width at half-maximum (FWHM) in the *i*-band is 0.88 arcsec and the coadd magnitude limit in the *i*-band is 23.44. More details of the survey data can be found in Abbott et al. (2018) .

2.1 Spectroscopic observations

Spectroscopic observations were carried out using three instruments: (1) the Gemini Multi-Object Spectrograph (GMOS-S) on the Gemini South telescope; (2) the Low Dispersion Survey Spectrograph (LDSS-3) on the Magellan Clay telescope; and (3) the Multi-Unit Spectroscopic Explorer (MUSE) on the European Southern Observatory (ESO) Very Large Telescope (VLT) Unit Telescope 4 (UT4). Table [1](#page-2-0) summarizes details of the spectroscopic data taken using these three telescope $+$ instrument setups.

The GMOS-S observations were taken as part of two programs: (1) a Gemini Large and Long Program (LLP; PI: E. Buckley-Geer; program IDs GS-2015B-LP-5 and GS-2017A-LP-5) of spectroscopic follow-up for DES strong lensing systems and for DES photometric redshift (photo-z) calibrations; and (2) a dedicated program (PI: H. Lin; program ID GS-2018B-Q-220) to observe line-of-sight galaxy redshifts and lensing galaxy velocity dispersions for our two lensed quasar systems. These programs observed a total of four GMOS-S multiobject spectroscopy (MOS) masks for DES J0408–5354 and two masks for WGD 2038–4008 , and the data were taken in queue mode on Gemini South during the semesters 2015B, 2017A, and 2018B. Nearly all the masks were each observed using both the GMOS-S B600 and R400 gratings, in order to provide spectral coverage over both blue and red wavelength ranges, respectively, spanning approximately 3800–7500 Å and 5000 –10 500 Å. Multiple science exposures were taken to reject cosmic rays, and the grating central wavelength was dithered slightly for different exposures to fill in wavelength gaps due to spatial gaps between the three GMOS-S CCDs. Flat field and wavelength calibration exposures were interspersed with the science exposures.

The LDSS-3 observations were taken as part of a semester 2018A Magellan program (PI: J. Frieman) to obtain line-of-sight galaxy spectroscopy for DES J0408–5354 and two other lensed quad quasar systems. Four LDSS-3 MOS masks were observed for DES J0408– 5354 over the two nights 2018 January 21, 22 UT. Each mask was observed using the LDSS-3 VPH-All grism, with wavelength coverage of about 3800–10 500 Å. Multiple science exposures were taken to reject cosmic rays. Flat field and wavelength calibration exposures were taken immediately before and after the sequence of science exposures.

The VLT MUSE observations were taken as part of an ESO program (0102.A-0600(E), PI: A. Agnello) to do integral field spectroscopy of DES J0408–5354 and its surrounding field. The MUSE observations were done in wide-field mode with adaptive optics corrections and were carried out over the two nights 2019 January 11 and 13. The final MUSE data cube covered an area of 92×95 arcsec², and the wavelength coverage spanned 4700–5803 Å and 5966–9350 Å. Additional spectroscopic analysis of the MUSE data and further details of the observations and data processing are given in Shajib et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-6).

2.2 Spectroscopic target selection

Galaxy targets for the Gemini and Magellan masks were selected using DES photometry. The exact selection criteria changed somewhat with time, due to improvements in DES photometric measurements, star–galaxy separation, and object catalogues. Specifically, three sets of selection criteria were used for the masks in Table [1,](#page-2-0) listed below in order from earliest to latest in time.

(A) *Gemini South masks (1)–(4):* Galaxies were selected from the DES Year 1 (Y1) 'Y1A1 COADD' catalogue (Drlica-Wagner et al. [2018\)](#page-24-12), using the *i*-band SExtractor AUTO magnitude (Bertin & Arnouts [1996\)](#page-24-13) cuts $20 \leq MAG_A UTO_I < 22.5$. No Milky Way extinction corrections were applied to the magnitudes before selection. Star–galaxy separation used the SExtractor SPREAD MODEL classifier (Desai et al. [2012\)](#page-24-14), also in the *i*-band: $SPREAD$ *MODEL₁* > 0.002.

(B) *Magellan masks (9)–(12):* Galaxy targets were now selected from the deeper DES Year 3 (Y3) data set, specifically from the 'Y3 GOLD' (Sevilla et al. in preparation) version 1.0 catalogue, using the *i*-band magnitude cuts $18 \leq MAG_A UTO_I < 23$, in particular extending the faint magnitude limit fainter to aim for a deeper sample. Again no Milky Way extinction corrections were applied to the magnitudes. Star–galaxy separation used the same *i*-band cut: *SP READ MODEL I >* 0*.*002.

(C) *Gemini South masks (5)–(8) and (14)–(16):* These masks were the latest to be designed and therefore used improved selection methods compared to the masks in (A) and (B). Galaxies were again selected from the 'Y3 GOLD' data set, but using the most current version 2.2 catalogue. We also changed the selection magnitudes from AUTO to MOF (Drlica-Wagner et al. [2018;](#page-24-12) Sevilla et al. in preparation) magnitudes, where the latter provide improved photometry, based on simultaneous multiepoch, multiband, and multiobject fits. The adopted *i*band cuts were $15 \leq MOF_CM_MAG_CORRECTED_I < 23$, where these MOF magnitudes also included Milky Way extinction corrections and several other sub-per cent photometric zero-point corrections (Sevilla et al., in preparation). Finally, we also updated the star–galaxy separation classifier to EXTENDED CLASS MASH MOF (Sevilla et al., in preparation), specifically using the cuts $EXTENDED\angle CLASS_MASK \rightarrow \text{C}$ (indicating 'high confidence galaxies') or 2 (indicating 'mostly galaxies'). For $i \le 22.5$, this classification should yield a galaxy efficiency *>* 98*.*5 per cent and a stellar contamination *<* 1 per cent (Sevilla et al., in preparation).

Each Magellan LDSS-3 and Gemini South GMOS-S mask included galaxy targets distributed over about a 5.5×5.5 arcmin² sky area centred on each lensed quasar system. Generally one to three slits on each mask were manually designed to target objects in or close to the lensed quasar system, e.g. to measure the redshift or velocity dispersion of the main lensing galaxy in each system, or to observe close nearby neighbour galaxies of the systems.

The remaining targets were selected automatically by $GMMPS²$ or maskgen, ³ the respective GMOS-S or LDSS-3 mask design software, both of which designed masks to maximize the number of targets observed. The potential set of galaxies that could be targeted was subject to the selection criteria described above. In addition, at the time each mask was designed, we removed from the initial target list any galaxies which already had high-confidence redshifts from previous observations, or which were already targeted on companion masks designed for the same semester's (Gemini) observing queue or (Magellan) observing run. Moreover, for the Magellan LDSS-3 targets (only), we assigned targeting priorities as inputs to maskgen, depending on the *i*-band magnitude and on the radius from the DES J0408–5354 quad system. Specifically, for galaxies with radius \leq 3 arcmin, we assigned priorities based on MAG_AUTO_I (as in criteria (B) above), with highest priority given to bright galaxies $MAG_AUTO_I < 19.5$, next priority to galaxies otherwise brighter than MAG _{- $AUTO$ </sup>- $I = 22$, and lowest priority} to galaxies otherwise brighter than MAG $AUTO = 23$. Finally, for galaxies with radius *>*3 arcmin, we assigned lower priorities than for galaxies \leq 3 arcmin, and these priorities were tied linearly to MAG_AUTO_I (with brighter galaxies at higher priority).

2.3 Data for the determination of the line-of-sight under/overdensities

In order to determine the line-of-sight under/overdensities for DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008, we need a catalogue of galaxy properties that includes magnitudes and photometric redshifts. We have used the catalogues from the Year 3 Gold version 2.2 catalogue.

We have used the photometric redshifts computed using the DNF machine-learning algorithm described in De Vicente, Sánchez & Sevilla-Noarbe [\(2016\)](#page-24-15). We also repeat the analysis using the photometric redshifts derived with the Bayesian Photometric Redshift (BPZ: Hoyle et al. [2018;](#page-24-16) Benítez [2000\)](#page-24-17) method. If an object has a spectroscopic redshift from Gemini or Magellan, as described below in Section 3.1, then we use that redshift instead of the photometric redshift. In Fig. [1,](#page-4-0) we show the comparison of the photometric redshifts from the DNF algorithm to the spectroscopic redshifts for objects with *i <* 22.5. The comparison of the DNF and BPZ photo-z's for the objects that only have photometric redshifts is shown also in Fig. [1](#page-4-0) for both DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038−4008 . We observe that there is no obvious mismatch between the two algorithms so we have used results from both of them in the subsequent analysis. We note that the photometric redshifts are computed using the photometry in the *griz* filters only, as Hoyle et al. [\(2018\)](#page-24-16) have found that the *Y*-band adds little to no predictive power.

2.3.1 The control field: DES

To apply the weighted number counts technique, we need a control field against which to determine an under/overdensity, the constraint we will eventually use to determine $P(\kappa_{ext})$. As both lensing systems are within the DES footprint we have chosen to use the full DES survey footprint of 5100 deg^2 to provide our control field. This differs from our approach in the past, where we have used control fields observed with the *Hubble Space Telescope (HST)* (Suyu et al. [2010b;](#page-25-13) Fassnacht et al. [2011;](#page-24-4) Greene et al. [2013;](#page-24-5) Suyu et al. [2013\)](#page-25-14), and from CFHTLenS (Heymans et al. [2012\)](#page-24-18), (e.g. Rusu et al. [2017;](#page-25-10) Birrer et al. [2019;](#page-24-6) Chen et al. [2019;](#page-24-7) Rusu et al. [2019\)](#page-25-11). The choice of control fields from DES itself, as opposed to other large-scale cosmological surveys, is optimal. This choice avoids potential biases to which our technique of obtaining *κ*ext from weighted number count ratios may be sensitive, such as due to mismatches in image resolution, depth and star–galaxy classification between the lens (target) fields and the control fields (e.g. Rusu et al. [2017\)](#page-25-10). The full Year 6 DES survey footprint consists of 10 169 tiles, each $10\,000 \times 10\,000$ pixels or 0.53 deg^2 in area. We take a sample of tiles from the centre of the footprint that are far from the survey edges and also eliminate tiles that contain very bright stars or very large galaxies. This results in a total of 5402 tiles of which we select 843 from across the survey footprint. For each tile we select six fields each of 1000×1000 pixels. This gives us a total of 5094 control fields spread over the sky and covering \approx 27 deg². The location of these six fields are shown in Fig. [2](#page-5-0) for one of the DES tiles. This should allow us to account for sample variance.

2.3.2 The galaxy samples for the target and control fields

For the target fields, we make an initial selection of all objects from the Y3 Gold catalogue that fall within a 4×4 arcmin² box centred on the lens. For the control fields, we make the same selection but using the centre of the control field. We select all objects that satisfy $FLAGS_GOLD = 0$ and $EXTENDED_CLASS_SOF >$ 2, which selects galaxies.4 We are using the Single-Object Fitting (SOF) magnitudes that are computed using a simplified version of the Multi-Object Fitting (MOF) algorithm described in Section 6.3 of Drlica-Wagner et al. [\(2018\)](#page-24-12). We select all objects with *i*-band magnitude $0 < SOF_CM_MAG_CORRECTED_I < 22.5$. The faint-end limiting magnitude, which is the same one used in Rusu et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-11) based on the analysis in Sluse et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-8), also for the purpose of constraining H_0 , ensures that the galaxy classification is reliable, and that the galaxy catalogue is complete. It is also deep enough (Collett et al. [2013\)](#page-24-19) to keep biases on κ_{ext} due to depth significantly below the 1 per cent level. We are using the photometric redshifts that were calculated using the SOF magnitudes, namely *DNF ZMEAN SOF* and *BPZ ZMEAN SOF*. We also require that the redshift *DNF ZMEAN SOF* or *BPZ ZMEAN SOF* of the objects satisfy $z < z_s$, where z_s is the source redshift, and that their distance Δr from the centre of the field is less than 120 arcsec. Fig. [3](#page-5-1) shows the objects that pass these selection criteria in a 1000×1000 pixel field around DES J0408-5354 and WGD 2038-4008 .

3 REDSHIFTS AND STELLAR MASSES

In this section, we first describe our spectroscopic redshift measurement procedure, summarize the results, and show the line-ofsight galaxy redshift distributions for each lensing system. We then describe and plot the spectroscopic redshift completeness for the overall galaxy samples in the two systems. Finally, we detail the procedures for measuring stellar masses using photometric model fitting for our galaxies.

⁴When comparing with the available *HST* data, we found that five objects in the WGD 2038–4008 field are erroneously classified by this pipeline, mainly in the form of stars wrongly classified as galaxies. As some of these are close enough to the lens to bias the inference described below, we were careful to correct the classification.

[²https://gmmps-documentation.readthedocs.io/en/latest/](https://gmmps-documentation.readthedocs.io/en/latest/)

[³https://code.obs.carnegiescience.edu/maskgen](https://code.obs.carnegiescience.edu/maskgen)

Figure 1. Upper figures: Comparison of the DNF and BPZ photometric redshifts for galaxies with no spectroscopic redshift which have *i <* 22.5 within 120 arcsec of the lens centre. The dashed line indicates BPZ = DNF. Left-hand panel DES J0408–5354 , right-hand panel WGD 2038–4008 . Lower figures: Comparison of spectroscopic and DNF photometric redshifts for galaxies with *i* < 22.5 within 120 arcsec of the lens centre. The dashed line indicates specz = DNF photo-z. Left-hand panel DES J0408–5354 , right-hand panel WGD 2038–4008 .

3.1 Spectroscopic redshifts

The Gemini and Magellan data were processed to 2D and 1D spectra using the IRAF Gemini and COSMOS (Dressler et al. [2011;](#page-24-20) Oemler et al. [2017\)](#page-25-15) reduction packages, respectively. Initial redshifts were determined automatically (without visual inspection) using the IRAF external package rvsao (Kurtz & Mink [1998\)](#page-24-21) to cross-correlate the 1D spectra against a set of SDSS galaxy templates. All processed 2D and 1D spectra, along with the corresponding automated redshift results, were visually inspected in order to assign final quality flags to the redshifts. If necessary, an automated redshift may be overridden and manually remeasured from the 2D or 1D spectrum. Only highconfidence redshifts were included in the subsequent analyses.

For DES J0408–5354 , we obtained 101 high-confidence galaxy redshifts from Gemini South GMOS-S and 70 from Magellan LDSS-3. From the VLT MUSE data, we obtained another 28 redshifts that were not already among the Gemini and Magellan redshifts, thus resulting in a total of 199 high-confidence redshifts for DES J0408– 5354 . For WGD 2038–4008 , we obtained a total of 54 highconfidence galaxy redshifts, all obtained from the Gemini South GMOS-S data. The above counts include the two redshifts of the main lensing galaxies in the systems. Fig. [4](#page-6-0) shows histograms of the redshift distributions for each lensing system.

3.2 Redshift completeness

We define spectroscopic redshift completeness to be the fraction of DES Y3 Gold (Sevilla et al., in preparation) galaxies that have redshifts (as described in Section 3.1). To define our photometric galaxy sample, we use the latest and best available version of the Y3 Gold catalogue, version 2.2, and we also use the same magnitude

Figure 2. A typical DES tile showing the location of the control fields. Each magenta box is 1000×1000 pixels.

and star–galaxy separation cuts as listed in target selection criteria (C) of Section 2.2 above.

For DES J0408–5354, the resulting spectroscopic redshift completeness is 0.68 for $18 \le$ *MOF CM MAG CORRECT ED I <* 23 galaxies and 5 arcsec *<* = radius *<*3 arcmin; see the top panels of Fig. [5.](#page-6-1) For WGD 2038– 4008 , the redshift completeness is 0.16 for the same *i*-band magnitude and radius ranges, as shown in the bottom panels of Fig. [5.](#page-6-1) Within the plotted magnitude and radius ranges, the redshift completeness stays fairly constant for both systems. The inner radius cut-off 5 arcsec is intended to exclude the quasar images from consideration. The outer radius cut is set at 3 arcmin as the redshift completeness drops very rapidly beyond this radius for either system.

3.3 Stellar masses

Stellar masses necessary for the computation of the flexion shift, the criterion used to separate between the structures which need to be accounted for in the lensing model, and those which can be incorporated inside κ_{ext} (see Section 6.1) were computed using the galaxy template fitting code LE PHARE (Arnouts et al. [1999;](#page-24-22) Ilbert et al. [2006\)](#page-24-23). In the LE PHARE fits, we either used our spectroscopic redshifts when available, or DES Y3 Gold DNF photo-z's (DNF ZMEAN SOF), combined with MOF photometry (Drlica-Wagner et al. [2018\)](#page-24-12) from the DES Y3 Gold (Sevilla et al., in preparation) version 2.2 catalogue. Specifically, we used the MOF CM MAG CORRECTED magnitudes and their associated errors in the *griz* filters, as these magnitudes included Milky Way extinction and other small photometric corrections (see 2.2).

The galaxy template set used in the LE PHARE fits were taken from the BC03 (Bruzual & Charlot [2003\)](#page-24-24) spectral energy distribution (SED) library. Specifically, we used a set of 27 BC03 simple stellar population models, computed using the Padova 1994 stellar evolution library (described in Bruzual & Charlot [2003\)](#page-24-24) and the Chabrier [\(2003\)](#page-24-25) initial mass function. The 27 models consisted of

Figure 3. The 1000×1000 pixel field of view for DES J0408–5354 (upper figure) and WGD 2038–4008 (lower figure). North is up and East is left. The $i < 22.5$ galaxies inside the 120 arcsec radius aperture are indicated by magenta squares for the objects with a spectroscopic redshift and green circles for the objects with no spectroscopic redshift. Stars are indicated by the cyan diamonds. The two concentric cyan circles indicate the apertures of 120 and 45 arcsec radius, respectively.

9 exponentially declining star formation rate (SFR) histories (with decay times $\tau = 0.1, 0.3, 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 15, 30 \text{ Gyr}$, each computed at three different metallicity values (0.4, 1, and 2.5 times solar). Each of the 27 models was also computed at different ages (ranging from 0.2 to 13.5 Gyr) and redshifts (up to a maximum redshift of 1.1, in steps of 0.03 in redshift). No dust extinction was included in the models, but recall the DES magnitudes already included correction for foreground Milky Way extinction. The stellar masses

Figure 4. Histograms of line-of-sight galaxy spectroscopic redshifts (Section 3.1) for the (left-hand panel) DES J0408–5354 and (right-hand panel) WGD 2038– 4008 systems. In each panel, the red vertical line indicates the redshift of the main lensing galaxy in each system.

Figure 5. Spectroscopic redshift completeness (defined in Section 3.2) for DES J0408–5354 (top panels) and WGD 2038–4008 (bottom panels). The left-hand panels show redshift completeness versus *i*-band magnitude, within the radius range 5 arcsec to 3 arcmin from the lens galaxy in each system. The right-hand panels show redshift completeness versus radius, within the *i*-band magnitude range 18 to 23. In all panels, the red horizontal line indicates the overall redshift completeness within the indicated magnitude and radius ranges for each system.

and uncertainties computed from the LE PHARE fits are tabulated in Table [A1.](#page-25-16)

For a few of the close neighbour galaxies of the two lensed quasar systems, the original object deblending and resulting photometry in the DES Y3 catalogue were clearly incorrect upon visual inspection of the images. In particular, for DES J0408–5354 , the neighbour galaxy with ID number 488066768 (or name G5, in Table [4](#page-15-0) or Table [A1\)](#page-25-16) had magnitudes that were too bright, and for WGD 2038– 4008 , the three neighbour galaxies with ID numbers 13, 14, and 15 (Table [A1\)](#page-25-16) were originally merged into a single object. To correct these photometry problems, we used the galaxy image fitting code GALFIT (Peng et al. [2010\)](#page-25-17) to redo the galaxy model fitting and photometry for these objects, based on the DES Y3 coadd images in the *griz* filters. These GALFIT results were used to compute stellar masses via LE PHARE.

4 VELOCITY DISPERSIONS OF LENSING GALAXIES

The main lensing galaxies in both the DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 systems were specifically targeted for stellar velocity dispersion measurements on a number of the spectroscopic masks listed above in Table [1.](#page-2-0) For these observations, we describe below the details of the targeting on the spectroscopic slits, the procedures used to extract the lensing galaxy spectra, and the method employed to measure velocity dispersions.

4.1 DES J0408–5354 G1

The main lensing galaxy G1 in DES J0408–5354 was measured from four independently observed spectra: two from Magellan LDSS-3, one from Gemini South GMOS-S, and one from VLT MUSE.

G1 was targeted on two of the four Magellan LDSS-3 masks listed in Table [1,](#page-2-0) 'des0408a' and 'des0408b'; hereafter these two masks will be denoted 'Magellan a' and 'Magellan b'. The slit setup for G1 was the same on both masks, while the remaining targets were different on the two masks. Specifically, the slit was oriented so that it included both G1 and quasar image B (the naming convention for the lensing galaxy G1 and the lensed quasar images A, B, and D are shown in Lin et al. [2017\)](#page-24-0). In addition, some contaminating flux from quasar image A was also visible in the 2D spectrum from the slit. To extract the 1D spectrum of G1, we first fit the spatial profiles along the slit (at each wavelength) of G1, B, and A by two Moffat profiles and a Gaussian profile, respectively. Moffat profiles were adopted for G1 and B because Gaussian profiles gave worse fits as determined by visual inspection. We subtracted off the best-fitting spatial profiles for B and A and summed the remaining flux over an extraction window along the slit of 1 arcsec (approximately the FWHM of G1's Moffat profile) or 2 arcsec (about the extent of G1's profile) in order to extract G1's 1D spectrum.

G1 was targeted on one of the Gemini South GMOS-S masks in Table [1,](#page-2-0) 'DESJ0408-5354 A2' (R400 grating), hereafter denoted 'Gemini A2,' on a slit which also included quasar image D. The procedure to extract G1's 1D spectrum was entirely analogous to that described above for the Magellan data. To fit the spatial profiles of G1 and D, Moffat profiles were again found to be better than Gaussians.

In the VLT MUSE data cube, the quasar and source light components were first modelled and removed, and the region near C and G2 was masked out. The remaining light from G1 was then extracted to a 1D spectrum by summing the light over a 1×1 arcsec² box or a 2.2×2.2 arcsec² box.

The velocity dispersion of G1 was then measured from the above data using the ULySS (Koleva et al. [2009\)](#page-24-26) galaxy spectral modelling package. In the rest wavelength range 4800 Å to 5500 Å, including the H β , Mg, and CaFe features, the G1 spectra were fit to Vazdekis et al. [\(2010\)](#page-25-18) stellar population models, which used the MILES stellar library (Sánchez-Blázquez et al. [2006\)](#page-25-19) and the Salpeter [\(1955\)](#page-25-20) initial mass function. The wavelength-dependent line spread function (LSF) in the Magellan and Gemini-South data were determined from the widths of the arc lamp lines in the respective wavelength calibration spectra, while the LSF of the MUSE data were taken from the fits given in §3.1 of Guérou et al. ([2017\)](#page-24-27). Because the Gemini-South and in particular Magellan LSFs were noticeably non-Gaussian, we

modified the ULySS package so that it could make use of an empirical LSF, instead of an analytic Gaussian (or low-order Gauss–Hermite) LSF. The resulting velocity dispersion measurements and associated statistical errors are given in Table [2,](#page-7-0) showing good agreement among the results from the four independent data sets. Plots of the 1D spectra and best-fitting models for the 1 arcsec extraction window cases are shown in Fig. [6.](#page-8-0)

4.2 WGD 2038–4008 G

The main lensing galaxy G in WGD 2038–4008 was measured from one spectrum observed using Gemini South GMOS-S, specifically on mask (14) listed in Table [1:](#page-2-0) 'DESJ2038–4008 A' (B600 grating), hereafter denoted 'Gemini A' for simplicity. One slit on this mask targeted galaxy G together with the quasar images C and D (the naming convention for the lensing galaxy and the lensed quasar images are shown in fig. 1 of Agnello et al. [2018\)](#page-24-1). To extract the 1D spectrum of G, we used the same method described above in Section 4.1. Specifically, we fit the spatial profiles of G, C, and D with three Moffat profiles, subtracted off the best-fitting profiles of C and D, and then summed the remaining flux over extraction windows of 1 or 2 arcsec along the length of the slit. The velocity dispersion of G was then measured with ULySS, using the same rest wavelength range and the same stellar population models as above in Section 4.1. The resulting velocity dispersion measurements and statistical errors are given in Table [2.](#page-7-0) The 1D spectrum and best-fitting model for the 1 arcsec extraction window case are shown in Fig. [6.](#page-8-0)

5 GALAXY GROUP IDENTIFICATION

5.1 Galaxy group identification algorithm

For galaxy group identification, we employed the same algorithm used in the spectroscopic analysis of the fields of H0LiCOW lenses HE 0435–1223 (Sluse et al. [2017\)](#page-25-7) and WFI 2033–4723 (Sluse et al. [2019\)](#page-25-8), which is based on the group-finding algorithms of Wilman et al. [\(2005\)](#page-25-21) and Ammons et al. [\(2014\)](#page-24-28). Wilson et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-22) uses a similar method, the results of which were used in the analysis of the H0LiCOW lens PG $1115 + 080$ (Chen et al. [2019\)](#page-24-7). We summarize the method here, and refer interested readers to Sluse et al. [\(2017\)](#page-25-7) for a more complete description and explanation of parameter choices in this algorithm.

Figure 6. The 1D spectra and fits involved in the velocity dispersion measurements of the main lensing galaxies G1 in the DES J0408–5354 system (top and middle panels) and G in the WGD 2038–4008 system (bottom panel), as described in Section 4 and listed in Table [2.](#page-7-0) The black curves in the plots show the observed data, in units of counts versus rest-frame wavelengths in Angstroms, while the red curves show the best-fitting models (details in Section 4). All the data and fits shown are for the case of a 1 arcsec extraction window (see Section 4 and Table [2\)](#page-7-0).

The first step towards identifying galaxy groups involves searching for candidate groups in the spectroscopic redshift distribution of the surveyed galaxy catalogue. We begin by constructing a redshift histogram with bins of width 2000 km s^{-1}. We identify redshift bins with five or more members as candidate groups. To ensure that candidate group members are not split across two bins due to an arbitrary choice of bin boundaries, we construct a second redshift histogram with the bins shifted by half a width of a bin (1000 km s^{-1}) , and count all non-duplicate redshift peaks from both histograms as candidate groups. We include all other galaxies that are within 1500 km s⁻¹of a candidate group member in that candidate group.

Once we have identified the candidate groups, we use a biweight location estimator (Beers, Flynn & Gebhardt [1990\)](#page-24-29) to calculate the mean (group) redshift of each candidate group. The group centroid is also calculated from the positions of the candidate group members. Since Sluse et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-8) found that using a luminosity-weighted scheme to calculate the centroid does not improve the match between the group centroid and brightest galaxy in this method, we do not use luminosity-weighted centroids here.

Once candidate groups have been identified, they are subjected to an algorithm that iteratively removes outliers in both redshift and angular space until the algorithm converges to a stable solution or a group membership of zero. The latter indicates that the candidate group is not gravitationally linked and is spurious. The algorithm is as follows:

(i) We set the initial observer-frame velocity dispersion, σ_{obs} to 500 km s−1. This value will be revised in subsequent iterations.

(ii) Candidate group members that are further than twice the velocity dispersion away from the group redshift are excluded from the group. This corresponds to the following limit

$$
\delta z_{\text{max}} = n \times \sigma_{\text{obs}}/c,\tag{1}
$$

where $n = 2$. This redshift limit is converted into an angular separation limit

$$
\delta\theta_{\text{max}} = \frac{c \times \delta z_{\text{max}}}{b(1+z) H(z) D_{\theta}(z)},
$$
\n(2)

where $H(z)$ is the Hubble parameter at redshift *z* and $D_{\theta}(z)$ is the angular diameter distance from the observer to redshift z. Following Sluse et al. (2017) , we set the aspect ratio $b = 3.5$. Candidate group members that have an angular separation that is larger than $\delta\theta_{\text{max}}$ from the group centroid are excluded from the group.

(iii) Once cuts have been made in both redshift and angular separation, we recalculate the group centroid, group redshift, and observed-frame velocity dispersion σ_{obs} from the remaining candidate group members. We obtain the latter two quantities following this framework:

(a) If there are more than 10 galaxies remaining, we use the biweight location and scale estimators to calculate the group

Table 3. Group properties in the field of view of DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008. The columns show the group ID, group redshift, number of spectroscopically identified galaxies in that group, the group rest-frame velocity dispersion (rounded to the nearest 10 km s^{-1}), the group centroid (in RA and Dec), projected distance of the centroid to the lens ($\Delta\theta$), and median flexion shift log(Δ_3x (arcsec)) (see Section 6.1 for methodology). All reported values are median quantities of 1000 bootstrapped samples, with uncertainties given by the 16th and 84th confidence intervals of the distribution of the bootstrapped quantity. Velocity dispersion estimates are rounded to nearest 10 km s−1. See Section 6.1.2 for further discussion.

ID	\bar{z}_{group}	N	$\sigma_{\rm rest}$ $(km s^{-1})$	$\sigma_{\rm int}$ $(km s^{-1})$	R_{200} (Mpc)	RA _{ctr} , DEC _{ctr} (deg)	$error(RA_{ctr}, DEC_{ctr})$ (arcmin)	$\Delta\theta$ (arcsec)	$\log_{10}(\Delta_3 x)$ $(log_{10}(arcsec))$		
						DES J0408-5354					
1	0.272	11	110 ± 20	<70	$0.30^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$	$62.096099, -53.903136$	0.67, 0.46	32^{+22}_{-16}	\leftarrow 5.88		
2	0.307	6	290^{+60}_{-90}	300^{+160}_{-80}	$0.81^{+0.15}_{-0.24}$	$62.065082, -53.919339$	0.71, 0.31	94^{+10}_{-10}	$-4.79^{+0.74}_{-0.63}$		
3	0.428	7	110 ± 30	< 70	$0.31_{-0.09}^{+0.07}$	62.130389, -53.936509	0.29, 0.29	156^{+10}_{-8}	<-8.04		
$\overline{4}$	0.570	5	140^{+30}_{-90}	< 160	$0.41_{-0.25}^{+0.09}$	$62.042510, -53.918109$	1.00, 0.52	122^{+28}_{-21}	<-6.53		
$5*$	0.599	17	240^{+30}_{-40}	220^{+60}_{-50}	$0.68^{+0.08}_{-0.11}$	62.079749, -53.901149	0.54, 0.18	26^{+16}_{-12}	$-3.86^{+0.97}_{-0.72}$		
6	0.751	3	80 ± 40	< 100	$0.21_{-0.11}^{+0.11}$	$62.147320, -53.872270$	0.05, 0.09	156^{+3}_{-2}	≤ -8.06		
7	0.768	5	120^{+30}_{-50}	< 120	$0.34_{-0.15}^{+0.10}$	62.084144, -53.898689	0.28, 0.24	17^{+12}_{-7}	<-4.83		
8	0.799	6	340^{+60}_{-80}	370^{+170}_{-100}	$0.96_{-0.22}^{+0.18}$	$62.143634, -53.894864$	0.64, 0.71	120^{+22}_{-22}	$-5.46^{+0.72}_{-0.59}$		
9	0.918	9	300^{+40}_{-50}	310^{+120}_{-70}	$0.86^{+0.10}_{-0.15}$	$62.051793, -53.892228$	0.49, 0.45	90^{+16}_{-17}	$-5.70^{+0.58}_{-0.52}$		
10	1.252	7	240^{+30}_{-50}	240^{+110}_{-70}	$0.67^{+0.09}_{-0.15}$	$62.124690, -53.913336$	0.69, 0.12	87^{+22}_{-21}	$-6.92^{+0.80}_{-0.71}$		
	WGD 2038-4008										
$1\star$	0.229	7	200^{+70}_{-60}	200^{+90}_{-70}	$0.53_{-0.16}^{+0.18}$	309.528309, -40.126006	0.41, 0.28	62^{+23}_{-24}	$-5.30_{-0.83}^{+0.90}$		
2	0.342	8	380^{+70}_{-90}	400^{+150}_{-100}	$1.05_{-0.26}^{+0.19}$	309.543495, -40.142963	0.54, 0.28	91^{+26}_{-27}	$-5.39_{-0.59}^{+0.73}$		

Note. \star Group contains the lens galaxy.

redshift and velocity dispersion, respectively (Mosteller & Tukey [1977\)](#page-24-30).

(b) If there are between 4 and 10 galaxies remaining (inclusive), we use the biweight location to calculate the group redshift and the gapper estimator to calculate the velocity dispersion (Wainer & Thissen [1976;](#page-25-23) Beers et al. [1990\)](#page-24-29).

(c) If there are fewer than four galaxies, we use the mean redshift as the group redshift and the standard deviation as the velocity dispersion.

Steps (ii) and (iii) are repeated until we reach a stable solution. Galaxies that are members of these identified groups are then used to infer group properties, such as the group redshift, centroid, velocity dispersion, and flexion shift (following the method described in Section 6.1. The rest-frame velocity dispersions are calculated from the observer-frame velocity dispersions using

$$
\sigma_{\text{rest}} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{obs}}}{1 + \bar{z}_{\text{group}}}.\tag{3}
$$

We then estimate uncertainties in the group properties by bootstrapping (i.e. random sampling with replacement) the group members of each group 1000 times. We recalculate the group properties of the resampled groups, and use the bootstrapped distribution in those quantities to estimate their uncertainties.

Because the associated measurement uncertainties of the galaxies in the spectroscopic redshift catalogue ($\Delta v_{\text{err}} \sim 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, see Section 3) are of the order of the measured velocity dispersion of many of the identified groups, care must be given to account for these uncertainties. To this end, we forward-model the kinematic data sets to infer the velocity dispersion given measurement uncertainties, following techniques used in dwarf-galaxy studies (e.g. Koposov et al. [2011;](#page-25-24) Walker & Peñarrubia 2011; Amorisco & Evans [2012\)](#page-24-32), where it has been found to be especially relevant for systems with small numbers of discrete kinematic tracers (Martin et al. [2018;](#page-24-33) Laporte, Agnello & Navarro [2019\)](#page-24-34). We construct a generative likelihood model for the data and evaluate the posterior probability

function is 1 $\left\langle v_i - \langle v \rangle \right\rangle$

$$
\mathcal{L} = \prod_{i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{\text{obs}}} \exp\left(-0.5\left(\frac{v_i - \langle v \rangle}{\sigma_{\text{obs}}}\right)^2\right),\tag{4}
$$

distribution for the intrinsic velocity dispersion, σ_{int} . The likelihood

where $\langle v \rangle$ is the mean velocity, the product is over all member galaxies *i* of the galaxy group, and $\sigma_{obs}^2 = \sigma_{int}^2 + \Delta v_{err}^2$. We assume $\Delta v_{\text{err}} = 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, and a non-informative Jeffreys prior for the intrinsic velocity dispersion σ_{int} (i.e. $p(\sigma_{int}) \propto 1/\sigma_{int}$) over the range 1 to 1000 km s−1. We also assume a uniform prior for the mean group velocity $\langle v \rangle$ over the range -500 to 500 km s^{-1} and treat it as a nuisance parameter. We then sample the posterior PDF using the emcee affine invariant Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampler (Goodman & Weare [2010;](#page-24-35) Foreman-Mackey et al. [2013\)](#page-24-36). We then report the median and 68th percentile confidence intervals of the posterior PDF for σ_{int} in Table [3.](#page-9-0) For groups where the posterior PDF for σ_{int} peaks near zero and the lower bounds are not wellconstrained, we report only the 68th percentile upper limits.

5.2 Identified groups in the environment of DES J0408–5354

We applied the galaxy group identification algorithm to the combined catalogue of 199 galaxies with high-confidence redshifts in the field of DES J0408–5354 described in Section 3. We identified 10 galaxy groups comprising of 76 galaxies from this spectroscopic sample, which we label Group 1–10 in order of increasing group redshift. Their properties are summarized in Table [3,](#page-9-0) and Fig. [7](#page-10-0) shows, for each identified galaxy group, the positions of both accepted and rejected trial member galaxies of that group in right ascension and declination, as well as the distances and velocities relative to the converged group centroid.

The largest galaxy group identified in this spectroscopic sample is Group 5, which contains 17 member galaxies, including the lens galaxy of DES J0408–5354 . The centroid of this group is close to

Figure 7. Galaxy groups identified in the spectroscopic sample of galaxies in the field of view of DES J0408–5354. For each group, the first plot (above) shows the positions of the candidate member galaxies associated with that group relative to the lens galaxy, with rejected group members represented as red squares and accepted group members represented as green circles. The lens galaxy DES J0408–5354 (star) and group centroid (cross) are also displayed. The *R*₂₀₀ radius of the group is represented by a solid line, while the dashed circle represents the angular separation cut of the group-finding algorithm in its final iteration. The second plot (below) shows the observer-frame velocity of individual member galaxies relative to the group centroid as a function of that galaxy's angular distance from the centroid. Galaxies that passed the iterative algorithm described in Section 5.1 are shown in green, while trial galaxy members that were cut through the algorithm are shown in red. Horizontal error bars represent the measurement error for each galaxy (see Section 3). The final observer-frame velocity dispersion and angular separation cuts from the group-finding algorithm are presented as dashed and dotted lines, respectively. We also show 1D histograms and rug plots of the velocity and distance distributions of the member galaxies. The 1D histograms are produced using a Kernel Density Estimate (KDE) with a bandwidth determined using Scott's Rule. In the 1D velocity histogram, the dashed blue line shows a Gaussian with width equal to the observer-frame velocity dispersion of the group.

Figure 7 – *continued*

DES J0408-5354 (26^{+16}_{-12} arcsec), which is also the most luminous member galaxy in the group.

Aside from group 5, the identified groups are generally small, with no identified group containing more than 11 member galaxies. For Groups 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7, the posterior PDFs for the intrinsic velocity dispersions peak at or near zero, and the lower limits are not well-constrained. For these distributions, we report the upper 68th percentile confidence intervals for these distributions and treat it as the upper limit of the intrinsic velocity dispersion for that group.

For groups 8 and 9, the distribution of member galaxies in velocity space appears to be bimodal, with two separate subgroups separated by [∼]1000 km s−1. However, there are not enough member galaxies in that redshift range to successfully separate these two subgroups

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/498/3/3241/5899060 by University College London user on 08 December 2020 Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/498/3/3241/5899060 by University College London user on 08 December 2020

into separate groups as none of the individual subgroups have more than five potential members.

The choice of parameters used in the group-finding algorithm described in Section 5.1 can impact the final membership of each galaxy group. As mentioned in Section 5.1, the choice of fiducial values for the initial observer-frame velocity dispersion $\sigma_{obs} = 500 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, velocity threshold $n = 2$ (equation 1), aspect ratio $b = 3.5$ (equation 2) follow that of previous group-finding analyses (Wilman et al. [2005;](#page-25-21) Sluse et al. [2017;](#page-25-7) Sluse et al. [2019\)](#page-25-8). We relaxed the parameter *n* to $n =$ 3 to investigate the effect of a more conservative (i.e. more inclusive) choice in the group finding algorithm and found that relaxing the parameters results in groups that contain outlier members, or have bior multimodal configurations, all of which are likely to be spurious.

As an additional sanity check, we inspected the Chandra Xray images of the field (PI: Pooley; Program 20419; ACIS-S; 25ks). No diffuse emission is detected (Pooley, D & Gallo, E., private communication), with an upper limit (90 per cent CL) of \sim 10⁴⁴ erg s⁻¹ within a 1Mpc radius (with considerable error bars depending on the assumed temperature). The non-detection makes it unlikely that the lens galaxy is a member of a galaxy cluster.

5.3 Identified groups in the environment of WGD 2038–4008

We applied the group-finder to the 54 galaxies with high confidence redshifts in the field of WGD 2038–4008 . From this sample, we identified two galaxy groups. The results and properties of these galaxy groups are summarized in Table [3,](#page-9-0) and Fig. [8](#page-13-0) show, for each identified galaxy group, the positions of both accepted and rejected member galaxies of that group, as well as the distances and velocities of individual galaxies relative to the group centroid. Group 1 in WGD 2038–4008 's field contain the eponymous lens galaxy of that field.

6 CONTRIBUTION OF ENVIRONMENT GALAXIES AND GALAXY GROUPS TO THE LENS STRUCTURE

6.1 Flexion shift formalism

A major objective of this analysis is to identify galaxies or galaxy groups along the line of sight or in the environment of lensing systems that significantly perturb the lensing potential of that system and require explicit modelling in the cosmological analysis. Perturbations that are weak can be treated as a tidal perturbation, producing external convergence and external shear at the position of the lens galaxy. However, perturbers that produce non-negligible third order (i.e. flexion) and higher perturbations to the lens potential cannot be well-approximated by the tidal approximation and will need to be explicitly treated in the lens model. Since the largest terms in the lens potential that are neglected in the tidal approximation are the third-order flexion terms, McCully et al. [\(2017\)](#page-24-3) proposes a simple diagnostic, the '*flexion shift*', which is a measurement of the difference in lensed image positions caused by the inclusion of the flexion terms from a perturber. As long as the flexion shift of a perturbing galaxy or galaxy group is much smaller than the astrometric precision of the observed lensed images, the perturber does not need to be explicitly treated in the lens model in a cosmographical analysis.

Following McCully et al. [\(2017\)](#page-24-3), the flexion shift is given by

$$
\Delta_3 x = f(\beta) \times \frac{(\theta_{\rm E} \theta_{\rm E,p})^2}{\theta^3},\tag{5}
$$

where θ_E and $\theta_{E, p}$ are the Einstein radii of the main lens and perturber respectively, and θ is the angular separation on the sky between them. The function *f*(*β*) is

$$
f(\beta) \in \left\{ \begin{aligned} (1 - \beta)^2 & \text{if perturber is behind the lens} \\ 1 & \text{if perturber is in the foreground} \end{aligned} \right\},\tag{6}
$$

where

$$
\beta = \frac{D_{\rm dp} D_{\rm os}}{D_{\rm op} D_{\rm ds}},\tag{7}
$$

is a combination of angular diameter distances involving the observer (o), deflector (d), perturber (p), and source (s), where the subscripts $D_{ii} = D(z_i, z_i)$ indicate the angular diameter distance between redshifts z_1 and z_2 .

This diagnostic provides a simple quantity to estimate the difference in lensed image positions caused by the leading order non-tidal (i.e. third-order) perturbation produced from a perturber. McCully et al. [\(2017\)](#page-24-3) showed that by explicitly modelling perturbers with flexion shifts larger than the conservative limit of $\Delta_3 x > 10^{-4}$ arcsec, we can constrain the bias on H_0 due to this uncertainty to the per cent level. We explain how the Einstein radii, $\theta_{\text{E}, p}$, as well as the flexion shift uncertainties for each perturber, are determined for galaxies in Section 6.1.1, and for galaxy groups in Section 6.1.2.

We calculated the flexion shift for all galaxies in the spectroscopic survey, as well as the flexion shift of all galaxy groups identified from the survey (Section 6.1.2). For individual galaxies, we exclude four objects that are in DES Y1 Gold catalogue but not in the DES Y3 Gold catalogue. We also exclude 12 galaxies with spectroscopic redshifts from MUSE because they do not have DES Y3 photometry. In addition, one galaxy in the spectroscopic sample (488065214) was found to have bad MOF magnitudes (MOF CM MAG CORRECTED magnitudes of −9999 for all bands), and two other galaxies (488069251, 488066060) were found to have bad MOF fits, with unrealistically large sizes (MOF_CM_T values on the order of \sim 5000 arcsec²) and MOF CM MAG CORRECTED I magnitudes that are brighter than their MAG_AUTO_CORRECTED_I magnitudes by more than four magnitudes (18.638176 and 17.868253 compared to 23.349312 and 22.776083, respectively). For these three galaxies with spurious MOF photometry, we used the MAG AUTO CORRECTED photometry to calculate the stellar masses of these galaxies instead.

For completeness, we also calculated the flexion shifts of all likely galaxies with photometric redshift estimates in the DES 'Y3 Gold' photometric catalogue within 10 arcmin of the lens galaxies, excluding galaxies that are in the spectroscopic sample. To do this, we made the following selections to the DES Y3 Gold catalog: First, we selected all objects within 10 arcmin of the lens galaxies in the Y3 Gold catalogue that satisfied FLAGS GOLD = 0 and EXTENDED CLASS MASH MOF \geq 2, which selected likely galaxies. From this catalogue, we excluded all galaxies that have COADD OBJECT IDs that matched galaxies already in the spectroscopic sample. We then selected objects with DNF photometric redshifts that satisfied DNF ZMEAN SOF *>* 0 and DNF ZSIGMA SOF *<* 10, which removed several objects with spurious redshifts. Finally, we made the following cuts specific to the field of each lens galaxy: For DES J0408–5354 , we removed objects with COADD OBJECT ID = 488068193, 488069583, 488067795, as they are features of the lens system and not galaxies in the environment of the lens. For WGD 2038–4008 , we removed objects with COADD_OBJECT_ID = 169192447 , 169193208, 169192589, 169193438 as they are misclas-

Figure 8. Galaxy groups identified using the spectroscopic sample of galaxies in the environment of WGD 2038–4008 . See Fig. [7](#page-10-0) for an explanation of the figures.

sified stars, and reincluded 169190696, which is a galaxy misclassified as a star (see footnote in Section 2.3.2). After applying these selection criteria, we obtained a photometric catalogue of 5082 objects within 10 arcmin of DES J0408–5354 and 4438 objects within 10 arcmin of WGD 2038–4008 . We then performed the same analysis on these objects as on the spectroscopic sample, using DNF ZMEAN SOF in lieu of spectroscopic redshift when necessary.

For the lens galaxies, we use the following quantities in our analysis: For DES J0408–5354, we use coordinates ${RA, DEC} =$ {62.090417, −53.899889}, lens redshift *z*^d = 0.59671, source redshift $z_s = 2.375$, and Einstein radius $\theta_E = 1.80$ (Lin et al. [2017;](#page-24-0) Shajib et al. [2019\)](#page-25-25). For WGD 2038-4008, we use ${R A, DEC} =$ $\{309.511379, -40.137024\}, z_d = 0.22829, z_s = 0.777, \theta_E = 1.38$ (Agnello et al. [2018;](#page-24-1) Shajib et al. [2019\)](#page-25-25).

6.1.1 Individual galaxies

We follow the general methodology described in Sluse et al. (2019) to estimate the Einstein radii of galaxies.

First, we inferred the stellar masses of galaxies from DES photometry using the galaxy template fitting code LE PHARE (see Section 3.3). We then use an empirical scaling relation to estimate the line-of-sight central velocity dispersion of the galaxy, σ . In this work, we use and compare results derived from two different scaling relations, one from Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) and another from Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37). The Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) relation was derived from a sample of [∼]3.7 [×] 105 SDSS elliptical galaxies at *^z <* 0.7 with stellar masses in the range $log_{10}(M_{\star}/M_{\odot}) \in [9.5, 11.5]$. The relation is fit with a broken power law given by equation (5) of Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26), which we rewrite here in logarithmic form:

$$
\log_{10}(\sigma) = \log_{10}(\sigma_b) + \alpha_1 \left(\log_{10}(M_{\star}) - \log_{10}(M_b) \right) \text{ for } M_{\star} \le M_b
$$

$$
\log_{10}(\sigma) = \log_{10}(\sigma_b) + \alpha_2 \left(\log_{10}(M_{\star}) - \log_{10}(M_b) \right) \text{ for } M_{\star} > M_b
$$

, (8)

where $\log_{10}(\sigma_b) = 2.073$, $\log_{10}(M_b/M_{\odot}) = 10.26$, $\alpha_1 = 0.403$, and α_2 = 0.293. Since Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) found no significant change of the scaling relation at different redshift bins, we assume that the stellar-mass-to-velocity-dispersion scaling relation does not evolve with redshift.

Alternatively, we also used the scaling relation from Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37), which was obtained from fitting a sample of 73 elliptical galaxy lenses from the SLACS survey. The best-fitting relation is

$$
\log_{10}(\sigma) = 0.18 \log_{10} (M_{\star}/(10^{11} \,\mathrm{M}_{\odot})) + 2.34,\tag{9}
$$

where we have opted to use the best-fitting parameters for the model that includes the intrinsic scatter, which is 0.04 ± 0.01 in the fit. The elliptical galaxies used for this fit are generally more massive compared to the sample used in the Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) analysis, and have stellar masses in the range $log_{10}(M_{\star}/M_{\odot}) \in [10.5, 12]$. We also assume that the stellar-mass-to-velocity-dispersion scaling relation does not evolve with redshift.

Once we obtain line-of-sight velocity dispersion estimates for each galaxy, we convert the velocity dispersion to the Einstein radius, $\theta_{\text{E},\text{p}}$, assuming a Singular Isothermal Sphere (SIS) model

$$
\theta_{\rm E,p} = 4\pi \left(\frac{\sigma}{c}\right)^2 \frac{D_{\rm ps}}{D_{\rm os}},\tag{10}
$$

from which the flexion shift can be calculated with equation (5).

The uncertainties for the flexion shifts are calculated by adding two different sources of uncertainty in quadrature. The first source comes from the uncertainty in the stellar mass estimates from LE PHARE. The second source of uncertainty comes from the intrinsic scatter in the scaling relation between stellar mass and velocity dispersion. For the Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) relation, we quantify this uncertainty by taking half the difference in the central 68th percentile limits of the velocity dispersion distribution at a given stellar mass and use that as the uncertainty from the intrinsic scatter of the scaling relation (see fig. 9A of Zahid et al. [2016\)](#page-25-26). For the Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37) relation, we use their fit for the intrinsic scatter, which is $\Delta \log_{10}(\sigma) = 0.05$ (taking the flexion shift. Flexion shift estimates for galaxies in the spectroscopic sample with stellar mass estimates that are significantly outside the mass ranges used to derive the Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) and Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37) scaling relations should be treated with caution, as the scaling relations (and errors) are extrapolated. Therefore, flexion shift estimates for galaxies in our sample with stellar masses $log_{10}(M_{\star}/M_{\odot})$ < 9.5 should be treated with caution, as both the scaling relations from Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) and Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37) may not be valid at the lower end of the stellar mass range. However, the validity of this extrapolation does not affect the main results of this study, since the most significant perturbers (i.e. galaxies that contribute the largest flexion shift contributions) tend to be more massive. The 10 galaxies with the largest flexion shift contributions at the lens positions of DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 (Table [4\)](#page-15-0) are within the stellar mass ranges used to derive at least one of the two scaling relations.

in quadrature, and then propagated forward into an uncertainty in the

6.1.2 Galaxy groups

For galaxy groups, we obtain a probability density function for the Einstein radius by adopting the same SIS approximation described in equation (10), and sampling 1000 values from the posterior PDF of the intrinsic velocity dispersion of the groups identified in Section 5.1 as well as from the bootstrapped PDF of the redshift of each group.

To obtain the flexion shifts of the galaxy groups and corresponding uncertainties, we use equation (5), sampling from the PDF of the Einstein radius as well as the bootstrapped group centroid position.

6.2 Flexion shifts for galaxies and galaxy groups in the field of DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008

We present a table of the properties of the 10 galaxies with the largest flexion shifts at the lens position in the fields of DES J0408– 5354 and WGD 2038–4008 . Comparing the results from the two scaling relations, the scaling relation from Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37) is shallower than the fit by Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26), but produces larger estimates of the line-of-sight velocity dispersion for galaxies with stellar masses $\log_{10}(M_{\star}/\rm{M}_{\odot}) \lesssim 11.45$. Since the majority of galaxies in the sample have smaller stellar mass estimates than that, the Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37) scaling relation produces larger flexion shifts than that from the Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) for this sample, and can be treated as the more conservative estimate of the two. In Figs [9](#page-16-0) and [10,](#page-16-1) we show the distribution of flexion shifts of the spectroscopic and photometric catalogues for the environment of DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 , using both the Zahid et al. [\(2016\)](#page-25-26) and Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37) scaling relations. The $log_{10}(\Delta_3 x) > -4$ criteria is indicated by the dashed vertical line.

When calculating flexion shifts for the photometric catalogue, we found some objects with spurious MOF CM MAG CORRECTED photometry. For these objects, we instead used stellar masses computed from MAG AUTO photometry, including the same Milky Way extinction and other photometric corrections as for the MOF magnitudes.

Using this criterion, for DES J0408–5354 , there are four galaxies (G3, G4, G5, G6) with flexion shift contributions above $\log_{10}(\Delta_3 x)$ *>* −4 when using the stellar masses from the Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37) scaling relation. These four galaxies are explicitly modelled in the' lens model analysis (Shajib et al. [2019\)](#page-25-6). In addition, the group including the lensing galaxy, group 5, has a flexion shift of $-3.86^{+0.97}_{-0.72}$ arcsec. The large uncertainties in the flexion shift of group 5 is due to a combination of the close proximity of the group centroid to DES J0408–5354 and the uncertainty in the centroid location, with the upper limits of the flexion shift being produced when the group centroid is near the lens galaxy.

For WGD 2038–4008 , we did not identify any galaxies or galaxy groups with a flexion shift $log_{10}(\Delta_3 x) > -4$.

6.3 Photometrically identified galaxy groups

6.3.1 REDMAPPER clusters in the field of the lenses

Due to the low spectroscopic completeness of the survey of WGD 2038–4008 , we complemented our spectroscopic group identification efforts with a search of all photometrically identified clusters with richness $\lambda > 5$ in the field of view of WGD 2038– 4008 using the REDMAPPER algorithm (Rykoff et al. [2014\)](#page-25-27). We used the sixth release of the REDMAPPER cluster catalogue on DES Y3A2 data $(v6.4.22 + 2)$ and found two REDMAPPER clusters within 3 arcmin of WGD 2038–4008 (with unique IDs MEM_MATCH_ID = 62659, 138669).

One of the clusters (62659) has a photometric cluster redshift of $z_{photo} = 0.221 \pm 0.008$ and a richness of $\lambda = 5.1 \pm 1.7$. The photometric cluster redshift of cluster 62659 is consistent with the spectroscopically identified Group 1 ($z_{\text{group}} = 0.229$), and its algorithmically identified central galaxy, COADD OBJECT ID = 169190452, is also a member of Group 1 (see Table [A2\)](#page-30-0), suggesting that REDMAPPER cluster 62659 and Group 1 are the same group. Only two of the seven spectroscopically identified group members in Group 1 (COADD OBJECT ID = 169190452, 169189459) are also members of the REDMAPPER cluster 62659. However, this could be simply due to bad photometric redshift estimates, as 4 of the 5 group members have DNF ZMEAN SOF photometric redshift estimates that range from 0.38 to 0.44, and the lens galaxy (169191076) has a spurious redshift estimate of 0.00977.

The second REDMAPPER cluster (138669) has a cluster redshift of $z_{\text{photo}} = 0.405 \pm 0.017$ and a richness of $\lambda = 10.8 \pm 2.0$. None of the galaxies in this cluster share group membership with the spectroscopically identified Group 2, suggesting that this group is distinct from Group 2.

For completeness, we also searched for REDMAPPER clusters in the field of DES J0408–5354 , though the spectroscopic completeness of the field of DES J0408–5354 is much higher than that of WGD 2038– 4008 . However, we did not find any clusters within 3 arcmin of DES J0408–5354 . One reason for this paucity is that a nearby region of the lens has been flagged and precluded from REDMAPPER analysis due to a bright star in the foreground.

6.3.2 Flexion shifts for REDMAPPER clusters near the lenses

We performed the same flexion shift calculations on the REDMAPPER clusters as the spectroscopic groups, following the procedure outlined in Section 6.1, using the same lens parameter quantities, and using the same conservative SIS approximation described by equation (10) for the perturber. We use the scaling relation given by equation (17) of Andreon & Hurn [\(2010\)](#page-24-38) to convert the cluster richness into a velocity dispersion estimates for the SIS model. From this, we obtain flexion shifts for the REDMAPPER clusters. For cluster 62659, we obtain a flexion shift of $\log_{10}(\Delta_3 x) = -5.1^{+0.3}_{-0.4}$. For cluster 138669, we obtain a flexion shift of $log_{10}(\Delta_3 x) = -6.0 \pm 0.2$. The estimated uncertainties come from propagating both the uncertainties in cluster

† Galaxy has spurious MOF photometry. For these galaxies, we use MAG-AUTO_CORRECTED photometry to calculate stellar masses instead. Galaxy has spurious MOF photometry. For these galaxies, we use MAG AUTO CORRECTED photometry to calculate stellar masses instead.

E. J. Buckley-Geer et al.

Table 4. Properties of the 10 galaxies with the largest flexion shifts, sorted in order of decreasing 68th percentile upper limits, in the field of DES J0408-5354 and WGD 2038-4008. The columns display, in order,

Figure 9. Flexion shift histograms for galaxies and galaxy groups in the environment of DES J0408–5354 .

Figure 10. Flexion shift histogram for galaxies and galaxy groups in the environment of WGD 2038–4008 .

richness, as well as the uncertainties in the scaling relation. The properties of both groups are summarized in Table [A3.](#page-32-20) Neither REDMAPPER groups in the field of WGD 2038–4008 exceeds the threshold of $log_{10}(\Delta_3 x) > -4$.

7 DETERMINING LINE-OF-SIGHT UNDER/OVERDENSITIES USING WEIGHTED NUMBER COUNTS

7.1 Description of the technique

To determine the line-of-sight under/overdensities, we follow the technique described in Section 5 of Rusu et al. [\(2017\)](#page-25-10). Like the CFHTLens control fields used in Rusu et al. [\(2017\)](#page-25-10), the DES fields also have saturated stars and other artefacts that are masked. Each DES coadd tile contains a mask plane that contains the bleed trails for the saturated stars but not the mask for the stars themselves. The masks for the stars and other artefacts such as dead CCD regions are contained in the mangle masks (Hamilton & Tegmark [2004;](#page-24-39) Swanson et al. [2008\)](#page-25-28) that are computed by DESDM for each tile. As can be seen from the upper image in Fig. [3,](#page-5-1) there is a large saturated star in the DES J0408–5354 field close to the lens. The *i* -band and *z*band mangle masks defined a very large mask around this star such that the entire 1000×1000 pixel area around the lens was masked. We therefore chose to use the mangle masks for the *r*-band images for both the target field and the control fields which did not have this problem. We also chose to use the *r*-band mask for WGD 2038–4008 for consistency. For each field (target and control), we combine the mask plane and the mangle mask to obtain the complete mask. We also use a 5.26 arcsec radius mask at the centre of the DES J0408– 5354 target field and a 2.63 arcsec radius mask for WGD 2038–4008 to remove the lensing galaxy and quasar images from the calculation. We then apply each control field mask to the target field and apply the target field mask to each control field, as described in Section 5.1 of Rusu et al. [\(2017\)](#page-25-10). Following the example of Rusu et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-11), for DES J0408–5354, we are manually removing from the target field catalogue four galaxies that are incorporated in the mass models of Shajib et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-6), in order to avoid double-counting their contribution to κ_{ext} .

We compute the median of the weighted counts for the target field $W_q^{\text{meds},t} = N_{\text{gal}}^t \times \text{median}(q_i^t)$, where q_t is the chosen weighting scheme, with $i = 1, ..., N_{\text{gal}}^t$ and N_{gal}^t is the number of galaxies in the aperture. We compute the same quantity for the control field $W_q^{\text{meds},c} = N_{\text{gal}}^c \times \text{median}(q_i^c)$. For each target field and control field combination, we calculate the ratio $\zeta_q = W_q^{\text{meds},t} / W_q^{\text{meds},c}$ for each target and control field combination. Our final weighted count for weighting scheme *q* is the median of this ratio over all target/control field combinations ζ_q^{meds} .

We focus on four weighting schemes we used in Birrer et al. [\(2019\)](#page-24-6), $q = 1$ which is just the raw counts $N_{\text{gal}}^t / N_{\text{gal}}^c$, weighting by redshift $q_z = z_s \times z_i - z_i^2$, weighting by distance to the lens/centre of the field $q_r = 1/r$ and weighting by distance to the lens/centre of the field and redshift $q_{z/r} = (z_s \times z_i - z_i^2)/r$. We have used two apertures, one of radius 120 arcsec and the other of radius 45 arcsec. In Figs [11](#page-17-0) and [12,](#page-18-0) we show the relative weights of each galaxy in the DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 fields for *i <* 22.5 and the two apertures 120 and 45 arcsec.

7.2 Resulting distribution for *ζ ^q*

We present our results for ζ_q^{meds} in Table [5.](#page-18-1) The uncertainties are derived from taking 20 samplings of the redshift and magnitude errors from a Gaussian PDF distribution corresponding to each galaxy. We show the results for both apertures and for both the DNF and BPZ redshift selections. In Fig. [13,](#page-19-0) we show the ratio ζ_q^{meds} for the four weighting schemes for both DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038– 4008 . Fig. [14](#page-20-0) shows a radial plot of the measured over/underdensity for each weight for four different aperture radii: 45, 60, 90, and 120 arcsec for both DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 . Our analysis shows that the field of DES J0408–5354 is significantly underdense (more so than any of the existing H0LiCOW lenses), and this is expected to lead to a tight, negative-value distribution of *κ*ext (e.g. Greene et al. [2013\)](#page-24-5). On the other hand, the field of WGD 2038–4008 is of about unit density in the 45 arcsec aperture, and overdense in the 120 arcsec aperture compared to the random fields.

Figure 11. The relative weights of the galaxies around DES J0408–5354 for the four weighting schemes $q = 1$, $q_z = z_s \times z_i - z_i^2$, $q_r = 1/r$, and $q_{z/r} =$ $(z_s \times z_i - z_i^2)/r$. The galaxies satisfy $i < 22.5$ and are represented by circles with areas proportional to their weights. The black circles indicate the 120 and 45 arcsec apertures.

7.3 Computing simulated ζ_q in the MS

We follow the approached described in Rusu et al. [\(2017\)](#page-25-10), in order to implement the same observational constraints to the galaxies in the MS as are relevant to the computation of ζ_q in the DES data. MS is a dark matter-only simulation of the Λ CDM cosmology, having a periodic box of 500 h^{-1} Mpc on a side with 2160³ $\approx 1.0078 \times 10^{10}$ particles. The simulation run was performed with a modified version of the GADGET-2 code (Springel et al. [2005;](#page-25-12) Lemson & Virgo Consortium [2006\)](#page-24-40) and has the spatial resolution limit of 5*h*−1kpc (Plummer-equivalent). The mass resolution $8.6 \times 10^8 h^{-1}$ M_o and the volume are enough to include a large variety of well-resolved objects from faint quasars to galaxy-clusters. Galaxies can be painted on to these dark matter-only haloes using semi-analytical models. Previous H0LiCOW work has employed the models by De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41), but here we are also exploring, for comparison, the newer models of Henriques et al. [\(2015\)](#page-24-42). The assignment of these galaxies to haloes follows different physical prescriptions, which are adjusted to fit typically low redshift observables. The available catalogues contain synthetic photometry in various bands; we select the *griz* magnitudes for each galaxy, and sample from them by assigning uncertainties taken from observed DES galaxies, over the same range of magnitude bins. We account for the fraction of galaxies in the target fields that have available spectroscopy, and also for the known DES galaxy-star contamination and incompleteness fractions. The latter fractions are corrected to account for the fraction of the

MNRAS **498,** 3241–3274 (2020)

target field apertures covered by *HST*, as *HST* imaging is assumed to result in the most reliable classification.

In Fig. [15](#page-20-1) we plot the resulting comparison of photometric redshifts and catalogue redshifts for a representative sample of the De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) and Henriques et al. [\(2015\)](#page-24-42) galaxies, up to the redshift of DES J0408–5354 (including for the redshift limit of WGD 2038–4008). Our photometric redshifts measured with BPZ have negligible bias up to a redshift of $z \sim 1$, above which there is significant scatter, due to the absence of infrared photometry beyond *z*-band. For the De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) models this is a small effect, as there are very few galaxies above this redshift (Fig. [16\)](#page-21-0), but the effect may be more pronounced for the Henriques et al. [\(2015\)](#page-24-42) models, which predict a significant number of galaxies at large redshift.

8 DETERMINING *P***(***κ***EXT)**

Our method of obtaining $P(\kappa_{ext})$ relies on selecting lines of sight from the MS which match the observed ζ_q constraints, and constructing the PDF of their associated κ_{ext} distributions, using the κ_{ext} maps produced by the ray-tracing technique of Hilbert et al. [\(2009\)](#page-24-43). This method has been described in detail in Rusu et al. [\(2017\)](#page-25-10), and updated in Birrer et al. [\(2019\)](#page-24-6) and Rusu et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-11). One point we wish to emphasize is that when we computed the relative over/underdensity of the DES J0408–5354 lens fields in Section 7.1, we removed individual galaxy perturbers that were explicitly incorporated into

Figure 12. The relative weights of the galaxies around WGD 2038–4008 for the four weighting schemes $q = 1$, $q_z = z_s \times z_i - z_i^2$, $q_r = 1/r$, and $q_{z/r} =$ $(z_s \times z_i - z_i^2)/r$. The galaxies satisfy $i < 22.5$ and are represented by circles with areas proportional to their weights. The black circles indicate the 120 and 45 arcsec apertures.

the lens modelling. By doing so, we ensure that these galaxies do not contribute to the $P(\kappa_{\text{ext}})$ we estimate, and we therefore avoid biasing our estimate high. This is accomplished without the need to alter the input $κ_{ext}$ maps.

Furthermore, we have shown in Section 6.2 that the group of galaxies at the redshift of the lens in DES J0408–5354 contributes a flexion shift close to our threshold for incorporating this structure into the mass models. We therefore compute $P(\kappa_{ext})$ for two cases. In the

Figure 13. The histograms of the weighted ratios for all ζ_q^{meds} for DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008. The vertical lines mark the median of the corresponding distributions. Black solid line – 120 arcsec aperture and DNF redshifts. Green dotted line – 120 arcsec aperture and BPZ redshifts. Red dashed line – 45 arcsec aperture and DNF redshifts. Blue dashed-dotted line – 45 arcsec aperture and BPZ redshifts.

first case, 'w/ group', we ignore the existence of this structure, and we include the LOS contribution of the constituent galaxies to $P(\kappa_{\text{ext}})$. In the second case, 'w/o group', we expect that the structure will be included in the lensing models of Shajib et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-6), Yildirim et al. (in preparation) and Wong et al. (in preparation), and we therefore exclude it from the LOS analysis. This is accomplished by removing the galaxy group members from the catalogue of galaxies around the lens, when computing the weighted count ratio constraints reported in Table [5.](#page-18-1) We adopt the technique from Rusu et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-11) and Chen et al. [\(2019\)](#page-24-7) to account for spectroscopic incompleteness. That technique consists of two different methods, one which uses the Andreon & Hurn [\(2010\)](#page-24-38) relation between group velocity dispersion and richness, and one which assumes Poisson statistics to compute

the number of additional galaxy members potentially missed due to sparse spectroscopy. We choose to use only the second method, as the first relies on numerous physical assumptions, and cannot reconcile the small velocity dispersion of the group (\sim 230 km s⁻¹) with the large number of observed members (17). We found a similar mismatch between the two methods in Chen et al. [\(2019\)](#page-24-7) for the lens $PG 1115 + 080.$

In Figs [17](#page-22-0) and [18,](#page-23-0) we plot the resulting distributions of $P(\kappa_{ext})$ for DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 , respectively, for a selection of weights, using the De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) galaxy models. The *ζ ^q* constraints are taken from Table [5,](#page-18-1) where we marginalize over the DNF and BPZ values. As in Birrer et al. [\(2019\)](#page-24-6), Rusu et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-11), we combine the ζ_q constraints from the 45 and 120 arcsec apertures. We

Figure 14. Radial plots of the measured weighted count ratios ζ_q^{meds} calculated for aperture radii of 45, 60, 90, and 120 arcsec. DES J0408–5354 : Red – DNF photometric redshifts, Blue – BPZ photometric redshifts. WGD 2038–4008 : Green – DNF photometric redshifts, Magenta – BPZ photometric redshifts.

Figure 15. Comparison of catalogue versus photometric redshifts computed for a representative fraction of the MS galaxies painted over the dark matter haloes, using the De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) (left-hand panel) and Henriques et al. [\(2015\)](#page-24-42) (right-hand panel) semi-analytical galaxy models and resulting synthetic photometry. The photometric redshifts are computed using BPZ, with the errors on the photometry being representative of the DES measurement uncertainties for similar magnitudes. The limiting magnitude used is $i < 22.5$ mag. The orange solid line marks the true ζ = photoz identity, and the blue dashed line marks the best linear fit. The plotting range extends to the redshift of DES J0408–5354 . The vertical black line marks the redshift of WGD 2038–4008 . For this lower redshifts, the scatter, fraction of outliers and bias become 0.051 (0.050 for Henriques et al. [2015\)](#page-24-42), 4.26 per cent (3.08 per cent), and 0.023 (−0.005), respectively.

Figure 16. Histograms of the catalogue and BPZ-based photometric redshift distributions for a representative fraction of ∼500 000 galaxies in the MS, using the semi-analytical models of De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) and Henriques et al. [\(2015\)](#page-24-42). The BPZ-based photometric redshift distribution for a similar number of DES galaxies, down to the same *i <* 22.5 mag limit, is also shown.

consider as fiducial distributions, to be used in the cosmological analysis, the ones which use as constraints the most robust ζ_q constraints, i.e. those with $q = 1$ and $q = 1/r$ in both apertures. In previous work, we also used the external shear values corresponding to the best-fitting mass models as an additional constraint. At the time our analysis was completed, the final shear values from Yildirim et al. (in preparation) and Wong et al. (in preparation), which will complement the cosmographic inference of Shajib et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-6), as well as for WGD 2038–4008 , were unknown. Therefore, we choose to report the statistics of $P(\kappa_{ext}|\zeta_1^{45''}, \zeta_{1/r}^{45''}, \zeta_1^{120''}, \zeta_{1/r}^{120''}, \gamma)$ for a variety of *γ* values, in Table [6.](#page-23-1)

For the choices in Fig. [17,](#page-22-0) we found that the use of the Henriques et al. [\(2015\)](#page-24-42) models results in $P(\kappa_{\rm ext})$ lower by $\kappa_{\rm ext} \lesssim 0.01,$ therefore at the \lesssim 1 per cent level. Based on the fact that the photometric redshift distribution of the DES galaxies in Fig. [16](#page-21-0) is more consistent with that of the De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) models (e.g. the large peak at $z \sim 0.5$ and the absence of galaxies above $z \sim 1.5$), as well as for consistency with our previous work on H0LiCOW lenses, we adopt the De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) models. We will test in more detail the impact of a particular choice of semi-analytical galaxy models, which appears to be comparatively larger for large source redshifts and over/underdensities, in another work, Mukherjee et al. (in preparation).

As expected from the significantly underdense field of DES J0408– 5354, the resulting fiducial $P(\kappa_{ext})$ distributions are tight (approximately 0.03 width in κ_{ext}), with medians around $\kappa_{ext} \sim -0.04$ to -0.05 , or 4–5 per cent.⁵ As the group contribution is removed from the LOS, $P(\kappa_{ext})$ decreases by $\lesssim 0.01$.

⁵The distributions of $P(\kappa_{ext})$ presented in this paper differ slightly from the ones used in the blind cosmographic analysis of DES J0408–5354 by Shajib et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-6). In addition to that work using the shear constraint derived therein, there is a minor difference owing to a clerical error discovered after unblinding, which corresponds to a change in H_0 of 0.13 per cent, much smaller than the statistical uncertainty of 3.9 per cent. In order to preserve the blindness of the *H*⁰ measurement, this correction has not been propagated through the Shajib et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-6) measurement. However, future measurements based on DES J0408–5354 should use the corrected distribution of $P(\kappa_{ext})$ given in this paper.

Appendix C of Rusu et al. [\(2017\)](#page-25-10) shows that our use of the MS to derive $P(\kappa_{\text{ext}})$ can bias the inference because of the different set of assumed cosmological parameters. However, since our $P(\kappa_{ext})$ is close to zero, the expected value of the bias, if we assume the cosmological parameters derived from *Planck* (e.g. Planck Collaboration XIII [2016\)](#page-25-29), is at a level of \sim 0.5 per cent, below the 1 per cent level of accuracy currently aimed at from time-delay cosmography (Suyu et al. [2017\)](#page-25-1).

9 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have presented work on three of the ingredients that are necessary to make a high-precision measurement of the Hubble constant H_0 using the lensed quasars DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 . These are (1) determining the velocity dispersion of the lensing galaxy, (2) identifying galaxies and groups along the line of sight that are close enough to the lens and massive enough that they need to be included in the mass model, and (3) estimating the external convergence *κ*ext due to less massive structures that do not need to be included explicitly in the mass model. These ingredients require spectroscopic redshifts for the galaxies in the fields of the two lenses. To obtain these, we have carried out spectroscopic observations using Gemini South/GMOS-S, Magellan/LDSS-3 and VLT/MUSE. As detailed in Sections 3.1– 3.2, we obtained a total of 199 high-confidence redshifts from the three instruments for DES J0408–5354 , corresponding to a redshift completeness of 68 per cent for galaxies with $18 \le i \le 23$ and 5 arcsec ≤ radius *<*3 arcmin. For WGD 2038–4008, we obtained 54 highconfidence redshifts from the Gemini South/GMOS-S data, with a 16 per cent redshift completeness for the same *i*-band magnitude and radius ranges.

As described in Section 4, in our redshift survey observations we also set aside slits to measure the stellar velocity dispersions of the main lensing galaxies in our two systems. The velocity dispersion of the main deflector G1 in DES J0408–5354 was measured using four independent spectra from the above three instruments, with a consistent result of about 230 km s−1(see Table [2\)](#page-7-0). The velocity dispersion for the main lensing galaxy G in WGD 2038–4008 was obtained from one spectrum taken using Gemini South/GMOS-S, with a resulting value of about 300 km s^{-1} . The detailed velocity dispersion measurements and uncertainties are given in Table [2.](#page-7-0)

The galaxy group identification uses the spectroscopic redshifts described above and the same algorithm that was used for the analysis of the H0LiCOW lenses HE 0435–1223 (Sluse et al. [2017\)](#page-25-7) and WFI 2033–4723 (Sluse et al. [2019\)](#page-25-8). We find 10 galaxy groups in DES J0408–5354 for which we then compute the flexion shift $\Delta_3 x$ proposed by McCully et al. [\(2017\)](#page-24-3). McCully et al. [\(2017\)](#page-24-3) showed that explicitly modelling perturbers with flexion shifts larger than $\Delta_3 x > 10^{-4}$ arcsec allows one to constrain the bias on H_0 due to this uncertainty to the per cent level. Out of our 10 groups in DES J0408– 5354, we find one group (labelled 5 in Table [3\)](#page-9-0) that has a flexion shift of $\log_{10} \Delta_3 x = -3.86^{+0.97}_{-0.72}$. This group has 17 members, one of which is the lensing galaxy G1 and the centroid of this group is close to the lens. However, Shajib et al. (2019) show that the change in H_0 of including this group would result in a decrease of approximately

Figure 17. Histograms of smoothed *κ*ext distributions for DES J0408–5354 for a variety of constraints, using the De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) semi-analytical galaxy models. 'w/ group' and 'w/o group' refer to the case when the member galaxies of the lens group are kept or not kept as part of the LOS, respectively. The first distribution shown is for the case when all LOS from MS are used, without constraints. The first two numbers in the legend are the median and the semidifference between the 16th and the 84th percentiles of each distribution, respectively.

0.4 per cent so it is not explicitly included in the mass model. For WGD 2038–4008 , we find two galaxy groups from our spectroscopic redshift sample, but neither group has flexion shift above our cut.

To calculate the flexion shift for individual galaxies, we start with the general methodology described in Sluse et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-8) and then use two different scaling relations (Auger et al. [2010;](#page-24-37) Zahid et al. [2016\)](#page-25-26) to estimate the line-of-sight central velocity dispersion of the galaxy from its stellar mass. The stellar masses are calculated using galaxy model fitting to DES photometry, as detailed in Section 3.3. The Auger et al. [\(2010\)](#page-24-37) relation between velocity dispersion and stellar mass gives more conservative, larger flexion shift values, resulting in four galaxies in DES J0408–5354 with flexion shifts larger than our $log_{10} \Delta_3 x = -4.0$ cut; these galaxies (G3, G4, G5, and G6 in Table [4\)](#page-15-0) are therefore selected for explicit modelling by Shajib et al. [\(2019\)](#page-25-6). For WGD 2038–4008 , we do not find any individual galaxies with flexion shift greater than our cut.

Our measurement of the external convergence *κ*ext starts with determining the line-of-sight under/overdensities for DES J0408– 5354 and WGD 2038–4008 using weighted number counts. We use a catalogue of galaxy properties for the two fields from the DES Year 3 Gold version 2.2 catalogue. As both of these fields are within the DES footprint, we are able to select the control fields from the DES catalogue as well. This helps us to avoid potential biases due to mismatches in, for example, image resolution between the target and control fields. Where available we use the spectroscopic redshifts for the galaxies in the target fields. As detailed in Section 7, for the galaxy counts we use four different sets of weights (including weighting by redshift and/or radius), two different apertures (one of radius 120 arcsec and the other of radius 45 arcsec), as well as two photometric redshift schemes (DNF and BPZ). For DES J0408– 5354, we remove the four galaxies (G3–G6 in Table [4\)](#page-15-0) which are explicitly incorporated into the lens model. Also for DES J0408– 5354, we calculate the weighted counts for both the case where the galaxy group containing the main deflector G1 is included in the count and the case where we explicitly exclude the group. We find that DES J0408-5354 lives in a significantly underdense environment whereas WGD 2038–4008 is in an environment that is closer to mean density. As described in Section 8, we then apply the same observational constraints to the MS, with galaxies from the De Lucia & Blaizot [\(2007\)](#page-24-41) semi-analytical model, to compute $ζ_a$, the ratio of weighted galaxy counts of target to control fields. We obtain $P(\kappa_{\text{ext}})$, the probability distribution of the external convergence κ_{ext} , by selecting lines of sight from the MS that match the observed *ζ ^q* constraints. As expected from the significantly underdense field of DES J0408–5354, the resulting fiducial $P(\kappa_{ext})$ distributions are tight (with width ≈0.03 in κ_{ext}) and medians around κ_{ext} ~ −0.04 to −0.05. For the case excluding the group containing G1 from the number counts, the median $\kappa_{\rm ext}$ decreases by \lesssim 0.01. The distributions for WGD 2038–4008 are much tighter, with width ∼ 1 per cent. This is

Figure 18. Similar to Fig. [17,](#page-22-0) for the case of WGD 2038–4008 .

Table 6. Statistics of $P(\kappa_{ext}|\zeta_1^{45''}, \zeta_{1/r}^{45''}, \zeta_{1}^{120''}, \zeta_{1/r}^{120''}, \gamma)$ as a function of *γ*, for the DES J0408–5354 and WGD 2038–4008 systems. We report the variation in the median and semidifference of the 16th and 84th quantiles. The error bar around each *γ* constraint is 0.005. For WGD 2038–4008 the distributions for large *γ* are too noisy to report.

	DES J0408-5354		WGD 2038-4008			
γ	med_{κ}	σ_{κ}	med_{κ}	σ_{κ}		
0.01	-0.053	0.025	-0.004	0.006		
0.02	-0.052	0.025	-0.002	0.007		
0.03	-0.049	0.026	0.002	0.008		
0.04	-0.046	0.027	0.008	0.011		
0.05	-0.041	0.029	0.016	0.017		
0.06	-0.035	0.032	0.032	0.028		
0.07	-0.028	0.035	0.056	0.038		
0.08	-0.020	0.039	0.074	0.042		
0.09	-0.009	0.043	0.101	0.046		
0.10	0.002	0.048	0.128	0.054		
0.11	0.018	0.054				
0.12	0.032	0.060				
0.13	0.046	0.067				
0.14	0.067	0.075	\cdots			
0.15	0.088	0.083				

expected due to the significantly lower source redshift ($z_s = 0.777$ for WGD 2038−4008 versus *z*_s = 2.375 for DES J0408–5354), as there will be fewer structures along the line of sight to contribute to the convergence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the anonymous referee for their helpful comments.

JP would like to thank Gourav Khullar for his help and insightful discussions that helped improve the analysis in this paper. This work made use of computing resources and support provided by the Research Computing Center at the University of Chicago. JP is supported in part by the Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago through grant NSF PHY-1125897 and an endowment from the Kavli Foundation and its founder Fred Kavli.

AJS was supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) through the Space Telescope Science Institute (STScI) grant *HST*-GO-15320. AJS was also supported by the Dissertation Year Fellowship from the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) graduate division.

TA acknowledges support from Proyecto FONDECYT N: 1190335.

This work was supported by World Premier International Research Center Initiative (WPI Initiative), MEXT, Japan.

CDF acknowledges support for this work from the National Science Foundation under Grant No. AST-1715611.

SM acknowledges the funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the EUs Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (COSMICLENS; grant agreement No. 787886).

Funding for the DES Projects has been provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. National Science Foundation, the Ministry of Science and Education of Spain, the Science and Technology Facilities Council of the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Kavli Institute of Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago, the Center for Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics at the Ohio State University, the Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy at Texas A&M University, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico and the Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Collaborating Institutions in the Dark Energy Survey.

The Collaborating Institutions are Argonne National Laboratory, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Cambridge, Centro de Investigaciones Energeticas, Medioambientales y ´ Tecnológicas-Madrid, the University of Chicago, University College London, the DES-Brazil Consortium, the University of Edinburgh, the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zürich, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Institut de Ciencies de l'Espai (IEEC/CSIC), the ` Institut de Física d'Altes Energies, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München and the associated Excellence Cluster Universe, the University of Michigan, the National Optical Astronomy Observatory, the University of Nottingham, The Ohio State University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Portsmouth, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford University, the University of Sussex, Texas A&M University, and the OzDES Membership Consortium.

Based in part on observations at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, National Optical Astronomy Observatory, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation.

The DES data management system is supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Numbers AST-1138766 and AST-1536171. The DES participants from Spanish institutions are partially supported by MINECO under grants AYA2015- 71825, ESP2015-88861, FPA2015-68048, SEV-2012-0234, SEV-2016-0597, and MDM-2015-0509, some of which include ERDF funds from the European Union. IFAE is partially funded by the CERCA program of the Generalitat de Catalunya. Research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Program (FP7/2007-2013) including ERC grant agreements 240672, 291329, and 306478. We acknowledge support from the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for All-sky Astrophysics (CAASTRO), through project number CE110001020.

This manuscript has been authored by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359 with the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes.

Based on observations obtained at the Gemini Observatory (acquired through the Gemini Observatory Archive and processed using the Gemini IRAF package), which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under a cooperative agreement with the NSF on behalf of the Gemini partnership: the National Science Foundation (United States), National Research Council (Canada), CONICYT (Chile), Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación Productiva (Argentina), Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação (Brazil), and Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute (Republic of Korea).

This paper includes data gathered with the 6.5 meter Magellan Telescopes located at Las Campanas Observatory, Chile.

Based on observations collected at the European Southern Observatory under ESO programme 0102.A-0600(E).

This work made extensive use of the Astropy library, a communitydeveloped core Python package for Astronomy (Astropy Collaboration [2013\)](#page-24-44).

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

REFERENCES

- Abbott T. M. C. et al., 2018, [ApJS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aae9f0) 239, 18
- Agnello A. et al., 2018, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1419) 479, 4345
- Ammons S. M., Wong K. C., Zabludoff A. I., Keeton C. R., 2014, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/781/1/2) 781, \mathcal{D}
- Amorisco N. C., Evans N. W., 2012, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21307.x) 424, 1899
- Andreon S., Hurn M. A., 2010, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.16406.x) 404, 1922
- Arnouts S., Cristiani S., Moscardini L., Matarrese S., Lucchin F., Fontana A., Giallongo E., 1999, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-8711.1999.02978.x) 310, 540
- Astropy Collaboration et al., 2013, [A&A,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201322068) 558, A33
- Auger M. W., Treu T., Brewer B. J., Marshall P. J., 2010, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3933.2010.00980.x) 411, L6
- Beers T. C., Flynn K., Gebhardt K., 1990, [AJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/115487) 100, 32
- Benítez N., 2000, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/308947) 536, 571
- Bertin E., Arnouts S., 1996, [A&AS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/aas:1996164) 117, 393
- Birrer S. et al., 2019, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz200) 484, 4726
- Bruzual G., Charlot S., 2003, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06897.x) 344, 1000
- Chabrier G., 2003, [PASP,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/376392) 115, 763
- Chen G. C. F. et al., 2019, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz2547) 490, 1743
- Collett T. E. et al., 2013, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt504) 432, 679
- De Lucia G., Blaizot J., 2007, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2006.11287.x) 375, 2
- Desai S. et al., 2012, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/757/1/22) 757, 22
-
- De Vicente J., Sánchez E., Sevilla-Noarbe I., 2016, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw857) 459, 3078 Diehl H. T., et al., 2019, The Dark Energy Survey and Operations: Year 6 – The Finale, United States
- Dressler A. et al., 2011, [PASP,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/658908) 123, 288
- Drlica-Wagner A. et al., 2018, [ApJS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aab4f5) 235, 33
- Fassnacht C. D., Koopmans L. V. E., Wong K. C., 2011, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.17591.x) 410, 2167
- Flaugher B. et al., 2015, AJ, 150, 43
- Foreman-Mackey D., Hogg D. W., Lang D., Goodman J., 2013, [PASP,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/670067) 125, 306
- Goodman J., Weare J., 2010, Commun. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci., 5, 65 Greene Z. S. et al., 2013, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/768/1/39) 768, 39
- Guérou A. et al., 2017, [A&A,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201730905) 608, A5
- Hamilton A. J. S., Tegmark M., 2004, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2004.07490.x) 349, 115
- Henriques B. M. B., White S. D. M., Thomas P. A., Angulo R., Guo Q., Lemson G., Springel V., Overzier R., 2015, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv705) 451, 2663
- Heymans C. et al., 2012, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21952.x) 427, 146
- Hilbert S., Hartlap J., White S. D. M., Schneider P., 2009, [A&A,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200811054) 499, 31
- Hoyle B. et al., 2018, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty957) 478, 592
- Ilbert O. et al., 2006, [A&A,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20065138) 457, 841
- Koleva M., Prugniel P., Bouchard A., Wu Y., 2009, [A&A,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200811467) 501, 1269
- Koposov S. E. et al., 2011, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/736/2/146) 736, 146
- Kurtz M. J., Mink D. J., 1998, [PASP,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/316207) 110, 934
- Laporte C. F. P., Agnello A., Navarro J. F., 2019, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty2891) 484, 245
- Lemson G., Virgo Consortium t., 2006, preprint [\(astro-ph/0608019\)](https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2006astro.ph..8019L/abstract)
- Lin H. et al., 2017, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aa624e) 838, L15
- Martin N. F., Collins M. L. M., Longeard N., Tollerud E., 2018, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aac216) 859, L5
- McCully C., Keeton C. R., Wong K. C., Zabludoff A. I., 2014, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu1316) 443, 3631

McCully C., Keeton C. R., Wong K. C., Zabludoff A. I., 2017, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/836/1/141) 836, 141 Morganson E. et al., 2018, [PASP,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/aab4ef) 130, 074501

Mosteller F., Tukey J. W., 1977, Data analysis and regression. A Second Course in Statistics, Available at: www.pearson.com

- Oemler A., Clardy K., Kelson D., Walth G., Villanueva E., 2017, COSMOS: Carnegie Observatories System for MultiObject Spectroscopy, Astrophysics Source Code Library, ascl:1705.001
- Peng C. Y., Ho L. C., Impey C. D., Rix H.-W., 2010, [AJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/139/6/2097) 139, 2097
- Planck Collaboration et al., 2016, [A&A,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201628636) 596, A105
- Refsdal S., 1964, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/128.4.307) 128, 307
- Rusu C. E. et al., 2017, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx285) 467, 4220
- Rusu C. E. et al., 2019, preprint [\(arXiv:1607.01403\)](https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2017MNRAS.465.4895W/abstract)
- Rykoff E. S. et al., 2014, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/785/2/104) 785, 104
- Salpeter E. E., 1955, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/145971) 121, 161
- Sánchez-Blázquez P. et al., 2006, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2006.10699.x) 371, 703
- Shajib A. J. et al., 2019, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty3397) 483, 5649
- Shajib et al., 2019, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa828) 494, 6072
- Sluse D. et al., 2017, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx1484) 470, 4838
- Sluse D. et al., 2019, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz2483) 490, 613
- Springel V. et al., 2005, [Nature,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature03597) 435, 629
- Suyu S. H., Marshall P. J., Auger M. W., Hilbert S., Blandford R. D., Koopmans L. V. E., 2010a, 1, 201
- Suyu S. H., Marshall P. J., Auger M. W., Hilbert S., Blandford R. D., Koopmans L. V. E., Fassnacht C. D., Treu T., 2010b, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/711/1/201) 711, 201
- Suyu S. H., Auger M. W., Hilbert S., Marshall P. J., Tewes M., Treu T., Fassnacht C. D., 2013, ApJ, 766, 70
- Suyu S. H. et al., 2017, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx483) 468, 2590
- Swanson M. E. C., Tegmark M., Hamilton A. J. S., Hill J. C., 2008, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2008.13296.x) 387, 1391
- Treu T., Koopmans L. V. E., 2002, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-8711.2002.06107.x) 337, L6
- Treu T., Marshall P. J., 2016, [A&AR,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00159-016-0096-8) 24, 11
- Treu T. et al., 2018, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty2329) 481, 1041
- Vazdekis A., Sánchez-Blázquez P., Falcón-Barroso J., Cenarro A. J., Beasley M. A., Cardiel N., Gorgas J., Peletier R. F., 2010, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.16407.x) 404, 1639
- Wainer H., Thissen D., 1976, Psychometrika, 41, 9
- Walker M. G., Peñarrubia J., 2011, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/742/1/20) 742, 20
- Wilman D. J., Balogh M. L., Bower R. G., Mulchaey J. S., Oemler A., Carlberg R. G., Morris S. L., Whitaker R. J., 2005, [MNRAS,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2005.08744.x) 358, 71
- Wilson M. L., Zabludoff A. I., Ammons S. M., Momcheva I. G., Williams K. A., Keeton C. R., 2016, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/833/2/194) 833, 194
- Wong K. C. et al., 2019, preprint [\(arXiv:1907.04869\)](https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2020MNRAS.tmp.1661W/abstract)
- Zahid H. J., Geller M. J., Fabricant D. G., Hwang H. S., 2016, [ApJ,](http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/832/2/203) 832, 203

APPENDIX A: PROPERTIES FOR ALL GALAXIES AND GALAXY GROUPS

We present the full sample of galaxies in the spectroscopic sample as well as the group membership of each identified group.

Table A1. Properties of all 199 galaxies in spectroscopic survey of the field of DES J0408–5354 and 54 galaxies in the spectroscopic survey of the field of WGD 2038–4008 , arranged in order of decreasing flexion shift on the lens galaxy. The columns display, in order, the galaxy ID, coordinates (RA, DEC in degrees; ICRS), redshift *z*, DES MOF_CM_MAG_CORRECTED *i*-band magnitudes (whenever possible), distances to the lensing galaxy and flexion shifts. Spectroscopic redshift uncertainties are about 100 km s⁻¹, or 0.00033 in redshift. Galaxies with bad MOF magnitudes are indicated with \dagger ; for these galaxies, we use MAG AUTO CORRECTED photometry and the corresponding stellar mass estimates from that photometric data. For the galaxy IDs, DES Y3 galaxies have 9-digit IDs, DES Y1 galaxies have 10-digit IDs, and MUSE galaxies were labelled with the prefix 'MUSE' and sorted by ascending redshifts. Stellar masses and corresponding uncertainties were calculated using the Le PHARE galaxy template fitting code and DES Y3 photometry (see Section 3.3). Flexion shift and uncertainties are calculated following the method described in Section 6.1–6.1.1.

Table A1 – *continued*

ID	RA (deg)	DEC (deg)	z	<i>i</i> -band Mag	$log_{10}(M_*)$ $(log_{10}(M_{\odot}))$	$\Delta\theta$ (arcsec)	$log_{10}(\Delta_3 x_{Zahid})$ $(log_{10}(arcsec))$	$log_{10}(\Delta_3 x_{Auger})$ $(log_{10}(arcsec))$
488067814	62.109798	-53.896296	0.78734	22.001	$9.90^{+0.20}_{-0.24}$	43.1	$-6.68_{-0.83}^{+0.56}$	$-5.83^{+0.24}_{-0.27}$
MUSE22/488065663	62.090044	-53.891845	1.09148	23.419	$10.22_{-0.27}^{+0.28}$	29.0	$-6.40_{-0.75}^{+0.59}$	$-5.83_{-0.29}^{+0.28}$
488072697	62.061177	-53.921532	0.27257	19.767	$10.33^{+0.04}_{-0.05}$	99.6	$-6.37^{+0.40}_{-0.52}$	$-5.87^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$
MUSE20/488065095	62.091419	-53.890585	0.94698	23.108	$9.91\substack{+0.34 \\ -0.26}$	33.6	$-6.74_{-0.85}^{+0.69}$	$-5.89_{-0.28}^{+0.31}$
488070825	62.106067	-53.909453	0.77562	21.908	$9.93_{-0.26}^{+0.21}$	47.8	$-6.74_{-0.84}^{+0.56}$	$-5.91_{-0.28}^{+0.24}$
488066235	62.023367	-53.910705	0.57025	19.314	$11.28^{+0.06}_{-0.17}$	147.4	$-6.00_{-0.36}^{+0.26}$	$-5.92^{+0.20}_{-0.24}$
489523492	62.067524	-53.881235	0.78001	20.704	$10.92^{+0.12}_{-0.18}$	82.9	$-6.17_{-0.46}^{+0.34}$	$-5.93_{-0.24}^{+0.22}$
489521356	62.083229	-53.863995	0.57765	20.123	$11.02_{-0.17}^{+0.07}$	130.1	$-6.14_{-0.42}^{+0.31}$	$-5.95_{-0.24}^{+0.21}$
488070625	62.057786	-53.908625	0.93778	21.744	$11.27^{+0.05}_{-0.07}$	76.0	$-6.04_{-0.31}^{+0.26}$	$-5.96^{+0.20}_{-0.21}$
488073290	62.106161		0.57035	20.933		92.5		$-5.98_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
		-53.923866			$10.36_{-0.12}^{+0.07}$		$-6.47^{+0.40}_{-0.54}$	
488074578	62.144676	-53.934498	0.27176	18.315	$11.11^{+0.05}_{-0.12}$	169.6	$-6.16_{-0.37}^{+0.29}$	$-6.01_{-0.22}^{+0.20}$
488070449	62.025309	-53.910519	0.42954	19.664	$10.95^{+0.05}_{-0.07}$	143.3	$-6.24_{-0.39}^{+0.32}$	$-6.01_{-0.21}^{+0.20}$
488073735	62.139479	-53.928501	0.42858	19.429	$10.95_{-0.07}^{+0.05}$	146.4	$-6.27_{-0.39}^{+0.32}$	$-6.04_{-0.21}^{+0.20}$
488072433	62.093088	-53.919040	0.30909	21.573	$9.45^{+0.09}_{-0.11}$	69.2	$-7.31_{-0.88}^{+0.58}$	$-6.06_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
489522058	62.078867	-53.872863	0.09083	18.298	$9.90^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	100.3	$-6.92_{-0.68}^{+0.49}$	$-6.07^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$
488066362	62.052505	-53.883271	0.94641	21.835	$11.50^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	100.2	$-6.14_{-0.24}^{+0.21}$	$-6.17^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$
488072414	62.148320	-53.919275	0.42744	20.060	$10.70^{+0.10}_{-0.07}$	141.2	$-6.50_{-0.45}^{+0.37}$	$-6.17^{+0.21}_{-0.21}$
488072532	62.024006	-53.921066	0.44478	19.809	$10.87^{\tiny{+0.06}}_{\tiny{-0.08}}$	160.1	$-6.49_{-0.42}^{+0.33}$	$-6.23_{-0.21}^{+0.20}$
488067185	62.020675	-53.907526	0.30566	19.692	$10.58^{+0.04}_{-0.05}$	150.5	$-6.64_{-0.47}^{+0.37}$	$-6.25_{-0.20}^{+0.20}$
488076699	62.096336	-53.944173	0.30792	19.259	$10.67^{+0.05}_{-0.07}$	159.9	$-6.62_{-0.46}^{+0.36}$	$-6.27^{+0.20}_{-0.21}$
MUSE21/488071544	62.087179	-53.913732	0.98821	22.458	$10.21_{-0.32}^{+0.23}$	50.3	$-6.88^{+0.53}_{-0.81}$	$-6.30_{-0.31}^{+0.25}$
488067820	62.129495	-53.889946	0.25191	21.049	$9.53_{-0.11}^{+0.09}$	90.3	$-7.49_{-0.86}^{+0.57}$	$-6.30_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
MUSE3/488069277	62.103394	-53.889095	0.40779	23.661	$8.52^{+0.27}_{-0.32}$	47.6	$-8.40^{+0.43}_{-0.53}$	$-6.31_{-0.31}^{+0.27}$
488068050	62.133568	-53.897135	0.46159	20.744	$9.75^{+0.09}_{-0.10}$	92.1	$-7.31_{-0.77}^{+0.53}$	$-6.32_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
MUSE26/488070824	62.095831	-53.909607	1.25062	22.383	$10.49_{-0.22}^{+0.19}$	36.8	$-6.76_{-0.57}^{+0.43}$	$-6.33_{-0.26}^{+0.24}$
488071089	62.049904	-53.911313	0.30581	21.203	$9.64^{+0.10}_{-0.12}$	95.3	$-7.43_{-0.83}^{+0.56}$	$-6.34_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
488065930	62.137580	-53.888784	0.57825	21.113	$10.08^{+0.11}_{-0.12}$	107.7	$-7.08^{+0.47}_{-0.65}$	$-6.38_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
488069700	62.083413	-53.882657	0.27216	22.456	$8.80^{+0.16}_{-0.21}$	63.8	$-8.23_{-0.72}^{+0.50}$	$-6.39_{-0.25}^{+0.23}$
489521068	62.092960	-53.861224	0.27153	20.306	$10.21^{+0.07}_{-0.12}$	139.3	$-6.98^{+0.43}_{-0.60}$	$-6.40^{+0.20}_{-0.22}$
489521448	62.103449	-53.864717	0.43985	20.616	$10.23_{-0.15}^{+0.10}$	129.6	$-6.97_{-0.62}^{+0.44}$	$-6.41_{-0.23}^{+0.21}$
488072561	62.053602	-53.920059	0.62960	21.216	$10.16_{-0.11}^{+0.09}$	106.6	$-7.04_{-0.61}^{+0.45}$	$-6.41_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
488074608	62.140970	-53.931443	0.43054	20.683	$10.53^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	156.2	$-6.84_{-0.48}^{+0.38}$	$-6.43^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$
488070133	62.169886	-53.887360	0.59607	20.158	$10.84^{+0.14}_{-0.12}$	174.5	$-6.74_{-0.44}^{+0.36}$	$-6.47^{+0.22}_{-0.22}$
488073762	62.131777	-53.926465	0.42904	21.665	$10.11^{+0.08}_{-0.14}$	129.8	$-7.15_{-0.65}^{+0.45}$	$-6.49^{+0.21}_{-0.23}$
488073021	62.080583	-53.922670	0.30741	21.184	$9.21^{\tiny{+0.08}}_{\tiny{-0.09}}$	84.6	$-7.96_{-0.89}^{+0.59}$	$-6.49^{+0.21}_{-0.21}$ -0.21
489522199	62.081990	-53.870601	0.39730	21.866	$9.72^{+0.14}_{-0.24}$	106.9	$-7.51_{-0.90}^{+0.56}$	$-6.50^{+0.22}_{-0.27}$
488072604	62.073251	-53.920150	0.77290	22.129	$10.07^{+0.16}_{-0.19}$	81.5	$-7.20_{-0.71}^{+0.50}$	$-6.50^{+0.23}_{-0.25}$
489521528	62.088464	-53.864945	0.24688	20.718	$9.83^{+0.09}_{-0.08}$	125.9	$-7.43^{+0.52}_{-0.73}$	$-6.52^{+0.21}_{-0.21}$
488069699	62.097258	-53.886716	0.92560	22.617	$9.67^{+0.22}_{-0.23}$	49.6	$-7.58^{+0.61}_{-0.91}$	$-6.52_{-0.27}^{+0.25}$
488070602	62.030809	-53.908820	0.26729	20.096	$9.86^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	130.4	$-7.45^{+0.50}_{-0.71}$	$-6.56_{-0.21}^{+0.20}$
489523576	62.050079	-53.881679	0.94745	22.694	$11.08^{+0.07}_{-0.08}$	107.8	$-6.73_{-0.36}^{+0.29}$	$-6.57^{+0.20}_{-0.21}$
MUSE24/488069253	62.104998	-53.902502	1.14831	23.055	$9.55_{-0.28}^{+0.26}$	32.3	$-7.76^{+0.66}_{-1.01}$	$-6.59_{-0.29}^{+0.27}$
488074678	62.146922	-53.934938	0.27044	19.713	$10.34_{-0.04}^{+0.04}$	174.0	$-7.09_{-0.52}^{+0.40}$	$-6.59_{-0.20}^{+0.20}$
488074840	62.107311	-53.932685	0.73105	21.409	$10.54^{+0.09}_{-0.11}$	123.4	$-7.00_{-0.50}^{+0.38}$	$-6.59_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
488071415	62.113750	-53.913080	0.74981	22.287	$9.54\substack{+0.18 \\ -0.15}$	68.6	$-7.78^{+0.61}_{-0.89}$	$-6.60_{-0.23}^{+0.24}$
488070947	62.158048	-53.912350	0.76818	18.274	$11.02^{+0.10}_{-0.14}$	150.3	$-6.80_{-0.41}^{+0.32}$	$-6.60_{-0.23}^{+0.21}$
488067669	62.135908	-53.895219	0.46127	22.257	$9.47^{+0.18}_{-0.28}$	98.0	$-7.85_{-1.03}^{+0.62}$	$-6.61_{-0.29}^{+0.23}$
488071411	62.045447	-53.913359	0.30642	21.438	$9.44^{+0.10}_{-0.11}$	107.0	$-7.89^{+0.58}_{-0.89}$	$-6.63_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
489523301	62.097716	-53.879281	0.27278	22.768	$8.75^{+0.16}_{-0.22}$	75.8	$-8.53^{+0.46}_{-0.67}$	$-6.65_{-0.26}^{+0.23}$
488072531	62.108813	-53.919489	0.75070	22.550	$9.73_{-0.20}^{+0.17}$	80.6	$-7.68^{+0.57}_{-0.86}$	$-6.67^{+0.23}_{-0.25}$
488070816	62.035444	-53.909470	0.60004	22.347	$9.92^{+0.23}_{-0.24}$	121.6	$-7.52_{-0.82}^{+0.58}$	$-6.68^{+0.25}_{-0.27}$
404169047	62.136795	-53.861686	0.16020	18.916	$10.04^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	169.1	$-7.42_{-0.63}^{+0.46}$	$-6.69^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$
488070607	62.037079	-53.908383	0.59964	22.356	$9.76^{+0.18}_{-0.21}$	117.2	$-7.72_{-0.85}^{+0.57}$	$-6.74_{-0.26}^{+0.23}$
			0.72762		$10.72^{+0.06}_{-0.11}$		$-7.10_{-0.46}^{+0.36}$	$-6.77^{+0.20}_{-0.22}$
488067357 404169634	62.163804	-53.896708 -53.871809	0.80252	21.625		156.1	$-7.28_{-0.72}^{+0.43}$	$-6.79^{+0.22}_{-0.22}$
	62.112378			21.675	$10.34_{-0.37}^{+0.15}$	111.3		
488074345	62.179533	-53.930268	0.43930	20.522	$10.58^{+0.06}_{-0.12}$	218.3	$-7.23_{-0.50}^{+0.37}$	$-6.84_{-0.22}^{+0.20}$
489521853	62.084697	-53.867583	0.27148	21.675	$9.27^{\tiny{+0.12}}_{\tiny{-0.13}}$	116.9	$-8.25_{-0.92}^{+0.60}$	$-6.84^{+0.21}_{-0.22}$
488078736	62.114845	-53.953040	0.42826	21.346	$10.35_{-0.09}^{+0.07}$	198.2	$-7.36^{+0.40}_{-0.53}$	$-6.86^{+0.21}_{-0.21}$

3268 *E. J. Buckley-Geer et al.*

Table A1 – *continued*

Table A1 – *continued*

ID	RA	DEC	z	<i>i</i> -band Mag	$log_{10}(M_*)$	$\Delta\theta$	$log_{10}(\Delta_3 x_{Zahid})$	$log_{10}(\Delta_3 x_{Auger})$
	(deg)	(deg)			$(log_{10}(M_{\odot}))$	(arcsec)	$(log_{10}(arcsec))$	$(log_{10}(arcsec))$
488078889	62.046282	-53.955925	0.19565	20.697	$9.31_{-0.10}^{+0.10}$	222.4	$-8.98^{+0.59}_{-0.90}$	$-7.60^{+0.21}_{-0.21}$
489521965	62.045558	-53.868686	0.89759	22.513	$10.04_{-0.24}^{+0.21}$	147.2	$-8.33^{+0.55}_{-0.78}$	$-7.60_{-0.27}^{+0.25}$
488065215	62.027412	-53.885104	1.10526	22.372	$10.66\substack{+0.26 \\ -0.37}$	143.9	$-7.99^{+0.45}_{-0.67}$	$-7.63_{-0.34}^{+0.27}$
488075166	62.149266	-53.934182	0.50880	22.887	$9.14_{-0.24}^{+0.19}$	175.5	$-9.18^{+0.63}_{-1.00}$	$-7.64_{-0.27}^{+0.24}$
488068535	62.149540	-53.895034	0.77707	22.702	$9.28_{-0.22}^{+0.24}$	126.6	$-9.06^{+0.66}_{-0.99}$	$-7.65^{+0.26}_{-0.26}$
488073904	62.151510	-53.927139	0.27214	22.822	$8.74^{+0.12}_{-0.16}$	162.5	$-9.55_{-0.58}^{+0.43}$	$-7.66^{+0.22}_{-0.23}$
488068835	62.019738	-53.894319	0.91905	22.531	$10.05_{-0.26}^{+0.21}$	151.3	$-8.40^{+0.54}_{-0.80}$	$-7.68^{+0.25}_{-0.28}$
405340125	62.147848	-53.880963	0.82674	22.738	$9.58_{-0.27}^{+0.23}$	139.6	$-8.83^{+0.64}_{-0.99}$	$-7.69_{-0.29}^{+0.26}$
488076126	62.098545	-53.939165	0.29568	22.286	$8.45^{+0.12}_{-0.11}$	142.4	$-9.86^{+0.19}_{-0.18}$	$-7.71_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$
488074972	62.158897	-53.933231	0.27187	22.261	$8.93^{+0.11}_{-0.13}$	188.4	$-9.43_{-0.79}^{+0.54}$	$-7.71^{+0.21}_{-0.22}$
488073464	62.128601	-53.924891	1.08324	22.899	$10.15_{-0.33}^{+0.25}$	121.1	$-8.35^{+0.57}_{-0.85}$	$-7.72^{+0.26}_{-0.32}$
488072862	62.014278	-53.921997	0.44369	22.954	$8.99^{+0.17}_{-0.23}$	180.0	$-9.41_{-0.92}^{+0.59}$	$-7.73^{+0.23}_{-0.26}$
488071425	62.019165	-53.913520	0.77498	22.912	$9.57^{+0.18}_{-0.24}$	158.9	$-8.89^{+0.60}_{-0.96}$	$-7.74^{+0.23}_{-0.27}$
488077585	62.091222	-53.947042	0.85319	23.034	$9.94^{+0.17}_{-0.20}$	169.8	$-8.57^{+0.54}_{-0.77}$	$-7.75^{+0.23}_{-0.25}$
404169398	62.129582	-53.867590	1.04896	22.750	$10.28^{+0.30}_{-0.36}$	142.9	$-8.28_{-0.72}^{+0.51}$	$-7.75^{+0.29}_{-0.34}$
488076873	62.062246	-53.943414	0.51666	22.956	$8.90_{-0.27}^{+0.28}$	167.7	$-9.51_{-0.89}^{+0.64}$	$-7.76_{-0.28}^{+0.28}$
404169833	62.165627	-53.875815	0.61452	22.767	$9.16_{-0.18}^{+0.22}$	181.6	$-9.30_{-0.95}^{+0.65}$	$-7.78^{+0.25}_{-0.24}$
488074337	62.173464	-53.929392	0.40472	22.616	$9.08^{+0.15}_{-0.17}$	205.6	$-9.40^{+0.60}_{-0.92}$	$-7.81^{+0.22}_{-0.24}$
488067934	62.032469	-53.898319	1.34023	21.519	$10.94_{-0.04}^{+0.05}$	123.0	$-8.04_{-0.39}^{+0.32}$	$-7.81^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$
488077841	62.133208	-53.947857	0.35684	22.687	$8.91_{-0.23}^{+0.17}$	195.1	$-9.57^{+0.56}_{-0.85}$	$-7.83^{+0.23}_{-0.26}$
488070960	62.031874	-53.910446	1.23026	21.226	$10.58^{+0.19}_{-0.19}$	129.8	$-8.25_{-0.54}^{+0.42}$	$-7.86^{+0.24}_{-0.25}$
489521442	62.031862	-53.864100	0.90591	22.699	$9.96_{-0.26}^{+0.24}$	179.0	$-8.74_{-0.83}^{+0.58}$	$-7.94_{-0.28}^{+0.26}$
488076117	62.040622	-53.939310	1.01820	22.596	$10.24_{-0.21}^{+0.18}$	176.9	$-8.54^{+0.49}_{-0.67}$	$-7.99^{+0.23}_{-0.23}$ -0.26
404169065	62.156908	-53.860476	0.75027	22.948	$9.44^{+0.23}_{-0.25}$	200.1	$-9.34_{-1.01}^{+0.65}$	$-8.07^{+0.25}_{-0.28}$
489520262	62.067931	-53.853616	0.91854	22.457	$9.71_{-0.23}^{+0.25}$	173.3	$-9.12_{-0.89}^{+0.63}$	$-8.10^{+0.26}_{-0.26}$
404169193	62.141088	-53.862996	1.16021	22.384	$10.50\substack{+0.21 \\ -0.30}$	170.9	$-8.52^{+0.44}_{-0.63}$	$-8.10^{+0.25}_{-0.30}$
404169489	62.136503	-53.870431	0.04355	21.430	$7.60^{+0.37}_{-0.32}$	144.3	$-11.07_{-0.51}^{+0.59}$	$-8.16^{+0.32}_{-0.31}$
404169659	62.146071	-53.872477	1.14904	21.682	$9.98^{+0.17}_{-0.22}$	153.9	$-9.09_{-0.78}^{+0.53}$	$-8.31_{-0.26}^{+0.23}$
488075055	62.169444	-53.933578	1.03614	22.691	$10.13_{-0.32}^{+0.17}$	206.8	$-8.97^{+0.50}_{-0.84}$	$-8.32_{-0.31}^{+0.23}$
404169176	62.145040	-53.862782	1.14723	22.928	$10.20_{-0.30}^{+0.24}$	176.9	$-8.92^{+0.55}_{-0.80}$	$-8.33^{+0.26}_{-0.30}$
404169154	62.149335	-53.862340	1.14884	22.251	$9.78^{+0.20}_{-0.24}$	184.1	$-9.66^{+0.59}_{-0.88}$	$-8.69^{+0.24}_{-0.24}$
488073779	62.020985	-53.927277	1.38408	22.280	$10.52^{+0.18}_{-0.24}$	177.2	$-9.12_{-0.58}^{+0.42}$	$-8.70^{+0.23}_{-0.27}$
488072310	62.161986	-53.918003	1.25287	22.603	$9.08_{-0.14}^{+0.18}$	165.2	$-10.89_{-0.89}^{+0.61}$	$-9.31_{-0.23}^{+0.23}$
488072700	62.160696	-53.920293	1.25468	22.908	$9.07_{-0.24}^{+0.25}$	166.2	$-10.93_{-0.98}^{+0.66}$	$-9.33_{-0.27}^{+0.26}$
488072408	62.161866	-53.918519	1.25018	22.937	$8.95^{+0.18}_{-0.19}$	165.7	$-11.10^{+0.58}_{-0.86}$	$-9.40^{+0.24}_{-0.25}$
404169985	62.153722	-53.878539	1.41999	22.613	$9.23_{-0.24}^{+0.26}$	154.7	$-11.00^{+0.68}_{-1.02}$	$-9.55_{-0.27}^{+0.27}$
489520462	62.073666	-53.855405	1.17034	22.110	$7.69^{+0.45}$ -0.45	164.0	$-12.93_{-0.72}^{+0.72}$	$-10.10^{+0.37}_{-0.39}$
489520752	62.055153	-53.858062	1.59303	22.328	$9.14_{-0.23}^{+0.29}$	168.1	$-11.75_{-0.99}^{+0.70}$	$-10.21_{-0.27}^{+0.28}$
3070263610	62.040098	-53.885262	1.32360			119.0		
3070263850	62.075161	-53.892278	0.91583			42.4		
3070265512	62.076105	-53.885866	0.91540			58.9		
3070264072	62.073661	-53.889176	0.76790		$\overline{}$	52.4		
MUSE1	62.093482	-53.907716	0.23983			28.9		
MUSE2	62.088497	-53.889554	0.28757			37.4		
MUSE4	62.079502	-53.896486	0.55446			26.2		
MUSE5 MUSE7	62.092164 62.086607	-53.902560 -53.902732	0.59221 0.59822			10.3		
MUSE11	62.092623	-53.909149	0.64338			13.0 33.7		
MUSE13	62.088612	-53.911555	0.76379			42.2		
MUSE16	62.075319	-53.889095	0.76863			50.4		
MUSE17	62.095373	-53.907544	0.82980			29.5		
MUSE18	62.069991	-53.898778	0.85458			43.5		
MUSE23	62.082424	-53.891043	1.13208			36.1		
MUSE27	62.084658	-53.911326	1.25152			42.9		
WGD 2038 $-$ 4008								
169190452	309.539131	-40.115839	0.22917	18.213	$10.76^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	107.9	$-6.39_{-0.43}^{+0.35}$	$-6.08^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$
169192596	309.492815	-40.140131	0.23003	21.389	$9.28^{\tiny{+0.11}}_{\tiny{-0.18}}$	52.3	$-7.61\substack{+0.60 \\ -0.96}$	$-6.21_{-0.24}^{+0.21}$
169191228	309.535586	-40.122881	0.22900	20.025	$10.13_{-0.11}^{+0.07}$	83.9	$-6.86^{+0.45}_{-0.62}$	$-6.21_{-0.22}^{+0.21}$

3270 *E. J. Buckley-Geer et al.*

Table A1 – *continued*

Table A2. Properties of galaxies in each trial group. The columns display, in order, the coordinates (RA, DEC in degrees; ICRS), redshift *z*, DES *i*-band MOF CM MAG CORRECTED magnitudes (if available; assigned a value of −99 if not), ID, and whether that galaxy passes the iterative group membership algorithm described in Section 5.1. Spectroscopic redshift uncertainties are about 100 km s−1, or 0.00033 in redshift. Galaxies with DES Y3 IDs have 9 digits, while galaxies with DES Y1 IDs have 10 digits. The lens galaxy is indicated as such, and galaxies with spectroscopic redshifts from MUSE have IDs that begin with 'MUSE'.

3272 *E. J. Buckley-Geer et al.*

Table A3. Properties of REDMAPPER clusters in the field of view of WGD 2038–4008 . The columns show the cluster ID, cluster redshift, richness, velocity dispersion (rounded to the nearest 10 km s−1), the group centroid (in RA and Dec), projected distance of the centroid to the lens (*θ*), and flexion shift $log(\Delta_3 x \text{(arcsec)})$. See Section 6.3 for further discussion.

¹*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, PO Box 500, Batavia, IL 60510, USA*

Table A2 – *continued*

²*Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA*

³*National Astronomical Observatory of Japan, 2-21-1 Osawa, Mitaka, Tokyo 181-8588, Japan*

⁴*Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA*

⁵*DARK, Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Lyngbyvej 2, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark*

⁶*Department of Physics and Astronomy, PAB, 430 Portola Plaza, Box 951547, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1547, USA*

⁷*Institute of Cosmology and Gravitation, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth PO1 3FX, UK*

⁸*Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, Stanford University, 452 Lomita Mall, Stanford, CA 94305, USA*

⁹*Departamento de Ciencias Fisicas, Universidad Andres Bello Fernandez Concha 700, Las Condes, Santiago, Chile*

¹⁰*Millennium Institute of Astrophysics, Monsen or Nuncio Sotero Sanz 100, Oficina 104, 7500011 Providencia, Santiago, Chile*

¹¹*Department of Physics, University of California Davis, 1 Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, USA*

¹²Laboratoire d'Astrophysique, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne *(EPFL), Observatoire de Sauverny, CH-1290 Versoix, Switzerland*

¹³STAR Institute, Quartier Agora - Allée du six Aout, 19c, B-4000 Liège, *Belgium*

¹⁴*Kavli IPMU (WPI), UTIAS, The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277- 8583, Japan*

¹⁵*Departamento de F´ısica Matematica, Instituto de F ´ ´ısica, Universidade de Sao Paulo, CP 66318, S ˜ ao Paulo, SP 05314-970, Brazil ˜*

¹⁶*Laboratorio Interinstitucional de e-Astronomia - LIneA, Rua Gal. Jos ´ e´ Cristino 77, Rio de Janeiro, RJ 20921-400, Brazil*

¹⁷*Instituto de Fisica Teorica UAM/CSIC, Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, E-28049 Madrid, Spain*

¹⁸*CNRS, UMR 7095, Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, F-75014 Paris, France* ¹⁹*Sorbonne Universites, UPMC Univ Paris 06, UMR 7095, Institut ´ d'Astrophysique de Paris, F-75014 Paris, France*

²⁰*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Pevensey Building, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9QH, UK*

²¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK*

²² Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas *(CIEMAT), Madrid 28040, Spain*

²³*Department of Astronomy, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1002 W. Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801, USA*

²⁴*National Center for Supercomputing Applications, 1205 West Clark St., Urbana, IL 61801, USA*

²⁵ Institut de Física d'Altes Energies (IFAE), The Barcelona Institute of *Science and Technology, Campus UAB, E-08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain*

²⁶*Institut d'Estudis Espacials de Catalunya (IEEC), E-08034 Barcelona, Spain*

²⁷*Institute of Space Sciences (ICE, CSIC), Campus UAB, Carrer de Can Magrans, s/n, E-08193 Barcelona, Spain*

²⁸*INAF-Osservatorio Astronomico di Trieste, via G. B. Tiepolo 11, I-34143 Trieste, Italy*

²⁹*Institute for Fundamental Physics of the Universe, Via Beirut 2, I-34014 Trieste, Italy*

³⁰Observatório Nacional, Rua Gal. José Cristino 77, Rio de Janeiro, RJ *20921-400, Brazil*

³¹*Department of Physics, IIT Hyderabad, Kandi, Telangana 502285, India* ³²*Department of Astronomy/Steward Observatory, University of Arizona, 933 North Cherry Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85721-0065, USA*

³³*Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, 4800 Oak Grove Dr., Pasadena, CA 91109, USA*

³⁴*Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA*

³⁵*Department of Physics, Stanford University, 382 Via Pueblo Mall, Stanford, CA 94305, USA*

³⁶*Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, P. O. Box 2450, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA*

³⁷*SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA*

³⁸*School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia*

³⁹*Center for Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA*

⁴⁰*Department of Physics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA*

⁴¹*Center for Astrophysics, Harvard and Smithsonian, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

⁴²*Australian Astronomical Optics, Macquarie University, North Ryde, NSW 2113, Australia*

⁴³*Lowell Observatory, 1400 Mars Hill Rd, Flagstaff, AZ 86001, USA*

⁴⁴*George P. and Cynthia Woods Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy, and Department of Physics and Astronomy, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA*

⁴⁵*Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Peyton Hall, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*

⁴⁶ Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats, E-08010 Barcelona, *Spain*

⁴⁷*Department of Physics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA* ⁴⁸*School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK*

⁴⁹*Brandeis University, Physics Department, 415 South Street, Waltham, MA 02453, USA*

⁵⁰*Computer Science and Mathematics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA*

⁵¹*Max Planck Institute for Extraterrestrial Physics, Giessenbachstrasse, D-85748 Garching, Germany*

⁵² Universitäts-Sternwarte, Fakultät für Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians Univer*sitat M¨ unchen, Scheinerstr. 1, D-81679 M ¨ unchen, Germany ¨*

This paper has been typeset from a T_EX/L^{AT}EX file prepared by the author.