

BlazEr1: The eROSITA Blazar Catalog

Blazars and Blazar Candidates in the First eROSITA Survey

S. Hämmerich¹, A. Gokus², F. McBride³, P. Weber¹, L. Marcotulli^{4,5}, A. Zainab¹, W. Collmar⁶, M. Salvato⁶, J. Wolf^{6,7}, T. Sbarrato⁸, S. Belladitta^{7,9}, J. Buchner⁶, S. Saeedi¹, L. Dauner¹, M. Lorenz¹, O. König¹⁰, C. Kirsch¹, K. Berger¹, S. Bahic¹¹, D. Tubín-Arenas¹¹, M. Krumpke¹¹, D. Homan^{12,11}, A. Markowitz¹³, P. Benke^{14,15,16}, F. Rösch^{14,15}, P. Rajasekar Kavitha¹, H. Tambe¹, M. Kadler¹⁴, E. Ros¹⁵, R. Ojha¹⁷, and J. Wilms¹

- ¹ Dr. Karl Remeis-Sternwarte and Erlangen Centre for Astroparticle Physics, Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Sternwartstr. 7, 96049 Bamberg, Germany
e-mail: steven.haemmerich@fau.de
- ² Department of Physics & McDonnell Center for the Space Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis, One Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO 63130, USA
- ³ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, ME 04011, USA
- ⁴ Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Platanenallee 6, 15738 Zeuthen, Germany
- ⁵ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29631, USA
- ⁶ Max-Planck-Institut für extraterrestrische Physik, Gießenbachstraße 1, 85748 Garching, Germany
- ⁷ Max-Planck-Institut für Astronomie, Königstuhl 17, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany
- ⁸ INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Brera, via E. Bianchi 46, 23807 Merate (LC), Italy
- ⁹ INAF – Osservatorio di Astrofisica e Scienza dello Spazio, via Gobetti 93/3, 40129, Bologna, Italy
- ¹⁰ Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
- ¹¹ Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysik Potsdam, An der Sternwarte 16, 14482 Potsdam, Germany
- ¹² Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge, CB3 0HA, UK
- ¹³ Nicolaus Copernicus Astronomical Center, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Bartycka 18, 00-716 Warsaw, Poland
- ¹⁴ Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Fakultät für Physik und Astronomie, Institut für Theoretische Physik und Astrophysik, Lehrstuhl für Astronomie, Emil-Fischer-Str. 31, 97074 Würzburg, Germany
- ¹⁵ Max-Planck-Institute for Radio Astronomy, Auf dem Hügel 69, 53121 Bonn, Germany
- ¹⁶ GFZ Helmholtz Centre for Geosciences, Telegrafenberg, 14476, Potsdam, Germany
- ¹⁷ NASA HQ, 300 E St. SW, DC 20546-0002, Washington DC, USA

Received — / Accepted —

ABSTRACT

Aims. *eROSITA* on board of the Spectrum Roentgen Gamma (SRG) spacecraft performed its first X-ray all-sky survey (eRASS1) between December 2019 and June 2020. It detected about 930000 sources, providing us with an unprecedented opportunity for a detailed blazar census. We present the properties of blazars and blazar candidates in eRASS1 and the compilation of the *eROSITA* blazar catalog.

Methods. We compile a list of blazar and blazar candidates from the literature and match it with the eRASS1 catalog, creating the Blazars in eRASS1 (BlazEr1) catalog. For sources with more than 50 counts we obtain their X-ray spectral properties. We compile multiwavelength data from the radio to the γ -ray regimes for all sources, including multiwavelength spectral indices and redshifts. The full catalog is available online.

Results. We present the BlazEr1 catalog, containing 5865 sources, of which 2106 are associated with confirmed blazars. For 3668 sources, *eROSITA* provides the first X-ray data. The contamination from non-blazar sources of the entire sample is less than 11%. Most candidates exhibit properties typical for blazars. We present properties of the entire X-ray detected blazar population, including the distributions of X-ray luminosities and photon indices, multiwavelength properties, and the blazar $\log N$ - $\log S$ distribution. Our catalog provides follow up targets, such as potential MeV and TeV blazars.

Conclusions. The BlazEr1 catalog provides a compilation of X-ray detected blazars and blazar candidates. The catalog serves as a starting point for exploiting further *eROSITA* surveys using the same methodology, enabling us to study the X-ray variability and a large number of spectral energy distributions of blazars in the future.

Key words. Catalogs – Surveys – Galaxies: active – Galaxies: jets – Quasars: general – BL Lacertae objects: general

1. Introduction

Active galactic nuclei (AGN) with relativistic jets with a line-of-sight orientation towards Earth are referred to as “blazars” (Blandford & Rees 1978; Blandford & Königl 1979; Antonucci 1993; Urry & Padovani 1995; Schlickeiser 1996). Relativistic

beaming makes blazars the most luminous persistent sources in the Universe and the dominant source type in X-ray and γ -ray wavelengths at high Galactic latitudes (Mattox et al. 1993), with high degrees of variability across the entire electromagnetic spectrum on time scales from minutes to years (e.g., Urry 1996;

Tanihata et al. 2001; Ciaramella et al. 2004; Agarwal et al. 2015; Rajput et al. 2020).

Blazars emit a double-peaked multiwavelength spectral energy distribution (SED, see, e.g., Middei et al. 2022; their Fig. 1), which is often modeled by two log-parabola components (Massaro et al. 2006; Hinton & Hofmann 2009; Madejski & Sikora 2016; Krauß et al. 2016; and references therein). The low-energy peak originates from synchrotron emission of electrons (and possibly positrons) in the relativistic jets (e.g., Marscher & Gear 1985). The peak of this emission component is typically located between the radio and the optical bands (Fossati et al. 1998). In contrast, the high-energy component, with the highest level of emission in the γ rays, can be explained with leptonic, hadronic, or lepto-hadronic models (Böttcher et al. 2013). In the leptonic scenario, the jet is assumed to consist of electrons and positrons. Photons inverse Compton scatter off of the relativistic electrons/positrons in the jet to higher energies. The up-scattered photons could originate from the same population of synchrotron photons (Synchrotron Self Compton radiation; SSC; Ginzburg & Syrovatskii 1965; Rees 1967; Jones et al. 1974; Maraschi et al. 1992; Dermer & Schlickeiser 1993; Bloom & Marscher 1996) or other photon fields such as thermal emission from the accretion disk, the broad line region or the torus (External Compton; EC; Sikora et al. 1994; Ghisellini & Madau 1996; Finke 2016; and references therein). In hadronic models, the high-energy peak would be produced exclusively by relativistic protons (e.g., Mannheim & Biermann 1992; Mannheim 1993; Mücke & Protheroe 2001; Mücke et al. 2003). Here, proton-photon interactions produce pions. Neutral pions and their subsequent decay cascades then produce the observable X-ray and γ -ray photons (Liodakis & Petropoulou 2020). Leptonic and hadronic SED models are able to describe multiwavelength data adequately well due to degeneracies, incomplete multiwavelength coverage, non-simultaneous data, and additional systematic uncertainties (e.g., Böttcher et al. 2013).

The spectral position of the peaks is a useful tool to classify blazars based on the energy of their synchrotron peak (Fossati et al. 1998; Abdo et al. 2010). Sources with low-energy peaks at $\nu_{\text{peak}} \leq 10^{14}$ Hz, above $\nu_{\text{peak}} \geq 10^{15}$ Hz, and in the intermediate range are called low (LSPs), high (HSPs), and intermediate peaked blazars (ISPs), respectively (Padovani & Giommi 1996). The X-ray band tends to fall in the energy range near the transition between the synchrotron and the high-energy peak. In a νF_ν representation, this results in a falling X-ray spectrum ($\Gamma > 2.0$) for a higher-peaked source where the X-rays probe the synchrotron emission. A low-peaked source exhibits a rising ($\Gamma < 2.0$) X-ray spectrum, that is, X-rays are part of the high-energy peak (Blandford et al. 2019; and references therein). This basic classification with regard to the photon index from a single snap shot observation can be systematically affected by source variability, as during outburst and flares, sources can exhibit a peak-shift behavior, including possible extreme HSP behavior (e.g., Pian et al. 1998; Giommi et al. 2000; Ahnen et al. 2018; Sahu et al. 2021; Gokus et al. 2024b).

Blazars have historically been classified based on optical spectra: sources showing emissions lines with widths of $> 5 \text{ \AA}$ are called flat spectrum radio quasars (FSRQs, Stickel et al. 1991), while sources with weaker or even no emission lines are classified as BL Lacs (BLLs). In the context of the peak energy classification, FSRQs are predominately LSPs, while BLLs are distributed among all these different categories (Ghisellini et al. 1998). FSRQs are more bolometrically luminous (Ghisellini 2013). In fact, the position of the synchrotron peak is thought to be connected to the overall luminosity via the so-

called “blazar sequence” – that is, due to more efficient cooling the more luminous sources peak at shorter frequencies (Fossati et al. 1998; Ghisellini 2013). It is not clear, however, if this sequence is due to selection effects (see e.g. Giommi et al. 2012; Keenan et al. 2021).

In order to understand the population and the X-ray properties of blazars as a whole, it is necessary to systematically study a large sample. Blazars have been targets of many X-ray observations, mainly focused on bright or variable sources, due to the extensive multiwavelength campaigns required for SED modeling. Different X-ray observatories have been used to build X-ray catalogs. For these catalogs of known blazars, identified through optical, radio, and γ -ray surveys (catalogs such as compiled by, e.g., Massaro et al. 2015; Ackermann et al. 2015), were matched against the observational data. Samples obtained using only one observatory were built using *Einstein* (Worrall & Wilkes 1990; 55 sources), *EXOSAT* (Sambruna et al. 1994a,b; 26 sources), *Beppo-SAX* (Donato et al. 2005; 86 sources), *ROSAT* (Urry et al. 1996, 36 BLLs, Perlman et al. 1996b, 23 BLLs, Turriziani et al. 2007, 510 confirmed and 173 new blazars), *Swift*-XRT (Giommi et al. 2019; OUSXB¹: 2308 sources), *XMM-Newton* (de la Calle Pérez et al. 2021; 103 sources), and *NuSTAR* (Middei et al. 2022; 126 sources). Other studies have used data from multiple X-ray missions (e.g., Comastri et al. 1997; Donato et al. 2001; Kadler 2005; Fan et al. 2012; Kapanadze 2013; Yuan & Fan 2014; >500 sources), often aiming at the multiwavelength properties of blazars. All these catalogs only cover previously observed areas of the sky, therefore, these observations are often biased towards the pre-selected sources proposed as observation targets, which may introduce further biases in sky coverage. The few X-ray catalogs providing nearly all sky coverage suffer from limited flux sensitivity and the number of sources in these samples is therefore small compared to the number of blazars known in other bands.

A first X-ray sample with all-sky coverage and a deeper X-ray flux limit was obtained with the *ROSAT* all-sky survey (RASS; Truemper 1982, 1993; Voges et al. 1999, 2000). The newest RASS catalog (2RXS; Boller et al. 2016) offers information for roughly 135000 sources with a limiting sensitivity of $F_{X,0.1-2.4\text{ keV}} \sim 10^{-13} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ in the 0.1–2.4 keV band. Shortly after its publication, RASS was used to study the photon index distributions of blazars (Urry et al. 1996; Perlman et al. 1996b) and to derive blazar catalogs (e.g., Turriziani et al. 2007). For a long time, the RASS was the most comprehensive X-ray all-sky survey. This changed with the advent of the extended ROentgen Survey with an Imaging Telescope Array (*eROSITA*) on the Russian Spectrum-Roentgen-Gamma (*SRG*) satellite (Merloni et al. 2012; Sunyaev et al. 2021). Launched in July 2019 from Baikonur, the mission began all-sky-survey operations in December 2019 (Predehl et al. 2021; Merloni et al. 2024). Consisting of seven nearly identical Wolter type 1 X-ray telescopes, called telescope modules (TMs), with a total field of view of 1° and frame store CCDs in the focal plane, *eROSITA* is sensitive in the 0.2–10.0 keV band. *eROSITA* performed an all-sky slew survey as *SRG*, which orbits L_2 , constantly rotated around the spacecraft-Earth axis with a period of 4 h. Distinct positions on the sky were therefore, on average, observed about six times in consecutive spacecraft rotations while the source remained in the field of view for about 40 s during every visit. Close to the ecliptic poles, which coincide with the survey poles, the number of consecutive observations

¹ DR3, which is based on 15 years of *Swift*-XRT data contains 2831 distinct blazars, we will use DR3 throughout the paper

is a lot higher. Due to its L_2 -orbit and its rotation around the Sun the whole sky could be covered within half a year. Therefore, *eROSITA* allows us to observe the entire sky in a systematic, unbiased (unaffected by triggering on sources of interest) way and to investigate source variability on time scales of hours and months. In total, *eROSITA* observed the full sky four times as operations had to be halted for political reasons during the fifth all-sky scan in late February 2022. During the first all-sky scan by *eROSITA* (eRASS1), between December 2019 and June 2020, nearly 930000 individual sources were detected on the Western Galactic hemisphere, which is accessible to the German *eROSITA* consortium (Merloni et al. 2024). This makes the eRASS1 catalog the largest X-ray source catalog to date. In the 0.5–2.0 keV band, 50% completeness across the entire sky is achieved at a flux of $\lesssim 5 \times 10^{-15} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The vast majority of eRASS1 sources are AGN ($\sim 80\%$), which enables a census of accreting supermassive black holes of unprecedented completeness. *eROSITA* data therefore provide a great opportunity to investigate the X-ray properties of the blazar population. The first *eROSITA* all-sky survey has already been used to identify potential TeV blazars for follow-up (Marchesi et al. 2025; Metzger et al. 2025), to investigate neutrino events (Adriani et al. 2025), to identify high-redshift blazars (Wolf et al. 2024), and to study the intergalactic medium with blazars (Gatuzz et al. 2024).

We present the first *eROSITA* eRASS1 blazar catalog, including the X-ray identification and the X-ray and multiwavelength properties of blazars and blazar candidates found during eRASS1. In Sect. 2, we discuss the preparation of a sample of previously known blazars and blazar candidate sources, which is matched against the eRASS1 all-sky data. In Sect. 3, we describe our identification of blazars and the analyses of the *eROSITA* data. Additional multiwavelength data are discussed in Sect. 4. The properties of the blazars and blazar candidates observed by *eROSITA* are discussed in Sect. 5. We summarize results and provide future prospects in Sect. 6. Throughout the paper, we will assume a flat Λ CDM cosmology with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$, and $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ (Beringer et al. 2012).

2. The BLAZE catalog: a catalog of blazars from the literature

As no recent standard catalog of blazars exists that includes all claimed or confirmed candidates in the literature, in this section, we describe how we create a “master” catalog of blazars and blazar candidates by cross-matching existing catalogs from the literature. This catalog is released with the paper.

2.1. Construction of the catalog

Older blazar compilations such as the Roma-BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015) miss a large number of newer sources. These catalogs are also significantly biased in terms of flux or region on the sky observed (e.g., Bellenghi et al. 2023). In order to search for X-ray counterparts of known blazars, we constructed a catalog of blazar and blazar candidates from catalogs found in the literature. As many sources will be part of multiple catalogs, we filter for duplicates by positional matching, taking into account the accuracy of the individual catalogs. The catalogs used to build the “master” list, the number of sources provided by the catalogs and the number of sources added, and the radii used to identify duplicates with respect to other catalogs and the spectral classes provided, are listed in Table 1.

Following, for instance, Giommi et al. (2019) and Bellenghi et al. (2023), we combine all blazars and blazar candidates from the latest data release of the fourth *Fermi*-LAT source catalog (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2020, 2022), the Roma-BZCAT multi-frequency catalog (Massaro et al. 2015), and the 3HSP catalog (Chang et al. 2019). For source positions of the *Fermi*-LAT blazars we use the coordinates of the associated counterparts provided in the 4FGL catalog, since the γ -ray positions are not well constrained enough. Duplicates were identified by position matching or using associations provided by the input catalogs. Since the catalogs have different spatial accuracy, each catalog is assigned an individually selected maximum radius within which sources were considered duplicates (see Table 1). In addition, we add 48 high-redshift blazars reported in the literature (Yuan et al. 2000, 2003; Sowards-Emmerd et al. 2003; Romani et al. 2004; Worsley et al. 2004; Shemmer et al. 2006; Healey et al. 2008; Sbarrato et al. 2012, 2013, 2015, 2022; Ghisellini et al. 2014, 2015b,a; Massaro et al. 2015; Coppejans et al. 2016; Belladitta et al. 2019, 2020; Caccianiga et al. 2019; Ighina et al. 2019; Khorunzhev et al. 2021; An et al. 2023; Marcotulli et al. 2025). This sample of high-redshift sources has been compiled by Sbarrato et al. (2025, in prep.), and extended by us with the source discussed by Marcotulli et al. (2025). This sample will be referred to as the HighZ sample.

In addition to sources with a confirmed blazar designation, we added objects with properties that are similar to those of blazars, with varying criteria depending on the input catalog. We start with the Milliquas catalog (Version 8, Flesch 2023). This catalog contains mainly AGN but also lists BL Lac-like objects identified via various detection methods. Based on WISE data, the KDEBLACS and WIRALS2 catalogs provide candidate blazars of various spectral types (D’Abrusco et al. 2019), while the ABC catalog (Paggi et al. 2020) uses ALMA calibration data as well as other multiwavelength information to characterize blazar candidates. The largest catalog used to build our candidate sample is the BROS catalog (Itoh et al. 2020). This catalog lists objects which exhibit a flat radio spectrum and a counterpart in Pan-STARRS1. Compared to other catalogs, BROS sources are not homogeneously spread across the entire sky, but cover areas with Galactic latitude $|b| \geq 10^\circ$ and declination $\delta > -40^\circ$. A small window centered around Galactic coordinates $b \sim 40^\circ$ and $l \sim 220^\circ$ is excluded due to a lack of radio coverage. In order to create the “master” list, we start with the first catalog shown in Table 1, then cross-match with the next catalog, and add any previously not included source, we continue with this process down the list of catalogs in Table 1.

Our initial list after positional cross-matching contains 103498 individual blazars and blazar candidates spread over the entire sky, 43148 ($\sim 41\%$) of which are located on the western Galactic hemisphere due to the inhomogeneity of the BROS catalog. Based on the input catalogs, we classify the blazars and blazar candidates into the following classes: (1) a BL Lac object is listed as *BLL*; (2) a galaxy dominated BL Lac Object is denoted as *BZG*; (3) Flat Spectrum Radio Quasars are abbreviated as *FSRQ*; (4) confirmed blazars of unknown type are called *BCU*. We append the letter ‘C’ to the abbreviation to indicate that a source is a blazar candidate (*BLLC*, *BCUC*, *FSRQC*). If no spectral classification is listed sources are denoted as *BCUC*, this includes all entries originating from the BROS catalog.

2.2. Assessment of quality

No source in the initial “master” list is guaranteed to be a blazar, especially since there are many candidates; thus it is important

Table 1. Blazar and blazar candidate catalogs used to build the BLAZE catalog. The order in which the catalogs are listed reflects the order in which we merged the catalogs. As the 4FGL-DR4 catalog is used as the first added catalog there is no catalog against which it has to be checked for duplicates, therefore, no match radius is listed. The radius given for the other catalogs is then used to filter for duplicates against all the previously added catalogs (therefore, e.g., only 1724 sources from the 5th Roma BZCAT are added, since the other sources are already part of the 4FGL-DR4 catalog within 4"). The horizontal line divides the catalogs of confirmed blazars from those containing only blazar candidates.

Catalog	N_{sources}	$N_{\text{sources,initial}}$	$N_{\text{sources,original}}$	Match radius "	Included classes	Reference
4FGL-DR4	3934	3934	3810	–	<i>BLL, BCU, FSRQ</i>	1
5th Roma BZCAT	3561	1830	1724	4	<i>BLL, BCU, FSRQ, BZG, BLLC</i>	2
3HSP	2013	777	773	3	<i>BCU</i>	3
HighZ	48	33	33	4	<i>BCU</i>	4, 5
Milliquas	2814	305	303	4	<i>BLLC</i>	6
KDEBLACS	5525	5035	4992	5	<i>BLLC</i>	7
WIBRaLS2	9541	7340	6165	2	<i>BLLC, BCUC, FSRQC</i>	7
ABC	1580	975	961	2	<i>BLLC, BCUC</i>	8
BROS	88211	83269	81607	5	<i>BCUC</i>	9

Notes. N_{sources} : Total number of sources contained in each catalog. $N_{\text{sources,initial}}$: number of initially new sources added to BLAZE catalog, taking into account duplicates from the previous catalogs within the match radius listed in column "Match radius". $N_{\text{sources,original}}$: number of sources from each catalog after applying quality cuts.

References. (1) Abdollahi et al. (4FGL-DR4; 2022); (2) Massaro et al. (2015); (3) Chang et al. (2019); (4) Sbarrato et al., in prep.; (5) Marcotulli et al. (2025); (6) Flesch (2023); (7) D’Abrusco et al. (2019); (8) Paggi et al. (2020); (9) Itoh et al. (2020)

to assess the contamination and remove as many non-blazars as possible.

Due to the extremely complex selection function, assessing the contamination is not straightforward. We therefore investigate a few indicators and assign upper limits to the level of contamination and check the purity of the input catalogs. In 4FGL about 98% of AGN are confidently classified as blazars, and we hence expect a very low level of contamination. A similar level of purity is expected from BZCAT, however, this catalog also contains radio galaxies such as Cen A. According to Xie et al. (2024) about 5% of BZCAT sources are non-blazars. The 3HSP contamination is expected to be < 2% (Chang et al. 2019) and similar levels are expected from the HighZ sample. Unfortunately, no level of contamination is listed for the sample of the Milliquas and the ABC. de Menezes et al. (2019) assessed the contamination of the WIBRaLS2 and KDEBLACS catalogs using SDSS. They find that 31% and 30%, respectively for these catalogs, are blazars. The main contamination is caused by QSOs (~69%), which could also be blazars, representing a loosely constrained upper limit. These catalogs are also tested by Xie et al. (2024). They find 14% and 12% to be non-blazars, respectively. The difference between the estimated levels of contamination for the WISE catalogs might be related to the entire sample not having available data in both approaches and due to other thresholds set to distinguish a blazar from a non-blazar. For the BROS catalog, Itoh et al. (2020) estimate a contamination of about 10%. Due to flux and spatial limits in the BROS data, only 60% of the BZCAT sources are also present in this catalog. Therefore, we expect roughly 5% of the blazars and about 14% of the candidates listed in the "master" list to be non-blazars, when utilizing the most conservative estimates presented above.

In order to identify non-blazar contamination by nearby galaxies in our list and since blazars have higher redshifts, we match with the HECATE catalog of nearby galaxies (Kovlakas et al. 2021), at the time of writing one of the most complete catalogs of galaxies in the local Universe ($D \lesssim 200$ Mpc). We obtain 1227 matches within 12" of the galaxy center, of which 1215 are located within the D_{25} -ellipse. Out of these, 57 positional matches are associated with confirmed blazars, including well known sources with redshifts consistent with the matched HECATE galaxy, hence the position alone is not enough to iden-

tify non-blazars. HECATE also offers a Hubble galaxy classification (de Vaucouleurs et al. 1976). Out of the positional matches 689 correspond to a spiral galaxy. Since blazars are typically not hosted in spiral galaxies (Urry et al. 2000; O’Dowd et al. 2002) and a location within the D_{25} -ellipse with a maximum separation of 12" indicates that in X-rays the source is undistinguishable from the center of the Galaxy, we exclude these 689 objects, almost 99% of which originate from the BROS catalog.

Xie et al. (2024) used moderate resolution radio images from the VLA Sky Survey (VLASS; Lacy et al. 2020) to classify the sources from BZCAT, WIBRaLS2, and KDEBLACS based on their morphology. We match the BLAZE catalog with their results using the match radii for the individual catalogs (see Table 1). If a visual assessment of the morphology exists we use this classification instead of the automated one. A two-sided radio morphology which is inconsistent with the source being a blazar is found for 1139 objects, which are removed.

A fraction of the narrow-line Seyfert 1 (NLSy1) galaxy population is detected in the radio band (e.g., Komossa et al. 2006; Singh & Chand 2018), among which a small sample has also been detected in the γ rays (e.g., Abdo et al. 2009; Paliya et al. 2018). Several works have shown that γ -loud NLSy1s exhibit blazar-like characteristics including bright flaring episodes (e.g., D’Ammando et al. 2015; Paliya & Stalin 2016; Gokus et al. 2021), but arrive at the conclusion that these objects resemble less powerful, that is, younger sources. We exclude γ -ray emitting NLSy1 galaxies from the BLAZE catalog to consider only 'full-scale' blazars. Two NLSy1s listed in the 4FGL are located on the western Galactic hemisphere and detected by *eROSITA* (1eRASS J094857.1+002226 and 1eRASS J200754.9–443446). To exclude NLSy1s which do not show γ -ray emission, we match with the catalog of NLSy1 galaxies by Rakshit et al. (2017). We find 55 matches within 5" of BLAZE sources, the maximum match radius used during the construction of the "master" list, of which 37 are associated with candidates that are also removed.

In order to identify other types of radio galaxies we match with the high fidelity sample by Gordon et al. (2023) of double radio sources, a morphology not expected to be observed for blazars. We again use a maximum separation of 5", identifying 1243 matches. More than 76% of these are associated with a

BROS source and overall 96.4% of the matches are blazar candidates. We also remove these as well.

Finally, we remove individual objects which are known to be non-blazars. BROS J0729.1+2054 is the counterpart of the Galactic planetary nebula NGC 2392. The nature of the source 4FGL J0647.7–4418 is debated in the literature either as being a blazar (Martí et al. 2020) or a B-type subdwarf and white dwarf binary (HD 49798 Mereghetti et al. 2009; Rigoselli et al. 2023). The young radio galaxy PMN J1603–4904 (Müller et al. 2015; Krauß et al. 2018) is falsely classified in 4FGL as the blazar 4FGL J1603.8–4903. Finally, the BZCAT catalog erroneously includes the radio galaxy Cen A as a blazar (5BZU J1325–4301).

2.3. Release and comparison with other catalogs

After removing obvious non-blazars, 100368 out of the initial 103498 objects remain. We call our “master” list of blazars and blazar candidates, the BLAZars from literature catalog, or BLAZE catalog. The BLAZE catalog can be split into a “gold sample”, which includes 6301 confirmed blazars with or without known type (3031 are located on the footprint of the eRASS1 survey), and a “silver sample” of 94067 candidates (38905 in the footprint of the eRASS1 survey), containing the blazar candidates. Figure 1 shows the spatial distribution of the gold sample. Due to the general utility of a compilation of blazars for the field, the BLAZE catalog is published with this paper and made available online on VizieR. The description of the BLAZE catalog is given in Appendix C, as the catalog is enriched with redshifts for the confirmed blazars and eROSITA exposure times and upper limits for flux and luminosity. The list of the likely non-blazar objects, referred to as the *unverified* BLAZE catalog, is released as a separate file.

In comparison to previous studies we find 6307 individual blazars from the 4FGL, Roma-BZCAT, and 3HSP catalogs, a slightly different number than in earlier catalogs (5340 sources, Giommi et al. 2019 and 6425 sources, Bellenghi et al. 2023). To avoid source confusion, we apply a stricter angular limit for cross-matching, leading to a difference between BLAZE and Giommi et al. (2019) and Bellenghi et al. (2023). The deviation of 15% between BLAZE and Giommi et al. (2019) is also related to this estimate being based on the 3LAC catalog which only contains 1591 sources in total compared to the 3934 included in the 4FGL catalog. However, the deviation between the BLAZE and Bellenghi et al. (2023) is only 2% mainly driven by the exclusion of contaminants. Marchesi et al. (2025) found 1772 matches between the BZCAT and the 4FGL, of which 1725 are within 2'', while our analysis returns 1625 within 4'' (1731 without quality cuts). This difference is ascribed to our match radius, as Marchesi et al. (2025) also accept wider separations for counterparts between the catalogs and our filtering. A total of 615 out of 651 objects in the isotropic catalog of Kudenko & Troitsky (2024) are contained in the BLAZE catalog, which includes 409 of the 433 blazars and blazar-like sources from the isotropic catalog. The objects not contained simply do not have a counterpart in Kudenko & Troitsky (2024; to within 6'). Out of the matches, 204 are classified as quasars, AGN or based on an emission band by Kudenko & Troitsky (2024) and 19 of these are associated with blazar candidates in the BLAZE catalog.

3. Matching eROSITA to the BLAZE catalog

In this section we describe the construction of our eROSITA blazar and blazar candidates catalog based on the BLAZE cat-

alog. Out of the 100368 blazar and blazar candidate sources in the BLAZE catalog, 41936 are located on the western Galactic hemisphere and are matched with eROSITA. We also assess the level of contamination of the catalog and the analysis of the X-ray data.

3.1. The eROSITA observed blazars and blazar candidates

3.1.1. X-Ray counterparts

To identify the X-ray counterparts of the BLAZE catalog, we match the BLAZE catalog and the eRASS1 catalog positions (Merloni et al. 2024). We use the BLAZE catalog and the attitude-corrected positions from eROSITA, and only consider point sources (EXT = 0.0, see Merloni et al. 2024), identifying an initial number 8117 matches with angular separation $\leq 15''$. This separation limit is based on the accuracy of the astrometric correction of eROSITA (Merloni et al. 2024) and the point spread function of the eROSITA telescopes. The histogram of the angular distance in Fig. 2 shows that most matches are within the positional accuracy of the matched eROSITA sources (shown in yellow, the normalized version of the histogram is displayed in Fig. A.1). About 84% of associations have an angular separation of 8'' or less, and 38% and 64% of the sample are located within 3'' and 5'', respectively. The distributions of separations for blazars and blazar candidates are different, the candidates exhibit a broader peak, possibly due to contamination. Based on the distribution of angular separation and in order to avoid unnecessary source confusion and false identifications we conservatively cut our final sample at a separation of 8'' between the BLAZE and eRASS1 source position. This cut reduces the sample to 6852 blazars and blazar candidates.

Since the eROSITA exposures are still quite low (~ 240 s), many sources have a low detection likelihood in eROSITA. To avoid including possibly spurious detections, we remove all matches with a detection likelihood, DET_LIKE_0 < 10^{-2} , which reduces the fraction of spurious sources to $\sim 1\%$ (Seppi et al. 2022; Merloni et al. 2024). We also remove all entries with uncertain positions, that is, without values for RA_LOWERR, RA_UPERR, DEC_LOWERR, and DEC_UPERR in the eRASS1 catalog, and exclude all objects where eROSITA quality flags indicate issues in the source detection (FLAG_SP_SNR, FLAG_SP_BPS, FLAG_SP_SCL, FLAG_SP_LGA, FLAG_SP_GC_CONS, FLAG_NO_RADEC_ERR, FLAG_NO_CTS_ERR, and FLAG_NO_EXT_ERR). Additionally, we remove all blazars and blazar candidates with X-ray luminosities too low to actually be a blazar ($L_{X,0.2-2.3\text{ keV}} < 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$), lowering our contamination rate. This reduces the sample size to 5865 sources of which 2106 are associated with confirmed blazars, and the remainder with blazar candidates. The normalized separation distributions shown in Fig. A.1 clearly indicate that after the applied cuts the agreement with the theoretical Rayleigh distribution is significantly improved. Table 2 lists the number of sources after each cut and for each blazar type, and Fig. 3 displays the sky distribution of the final sample.

The matches outlined above are the basis for the **Blazars in eRASS1** (BlazEr1) catalog. This catalog combines X-ray and multiwavelength information that we compiled for all catalog sources. A detailed description of the content of the catalogs is given in Appendix D. We will refer to the sample of sources de-

² DET_LIKE_0 equals the negative logarithm of the probability of detected counts being caused by fluctuations of the background




Fig. 1. All-sky distribution of the BLAZE catalog gold sample (confirmed blazars) in Galactic coordinates (*BLL*: 1697, *FSRQ*: 1937, *BCU*: 2503, *BZG*: 164). The different blazar classes are shown color coded and with different symbols.

Table 2. Break down of the blazar source classes during the construction of our catalog of *eROSITA*-observed blazars and *eROSITA*-observed blazar candidates.

Class	Acronym	N_{BLAZE}	N_{eRASS1}	$N_{\text{match},15}$	$N_{\text{match},8}$	N_{sample}	N_{new}	N_{spec}	$N_{\text{spec,new}}$
BL Lac object	<i>BLL</i>	1697	802	682	641	597	90	353	37
BL Lac candidate	<i>BLLC</i>	7750	3188	1269	1099	954	701	185	106
Galaxy dominated BL Lac object	<i>BZG</i>	164	59	33	32	28	14	8	2
Flat Spectrum Radio Quasar	<i>FSRQ</i>	1937	929	844	796	769	332	220	60
<i>FSRQ</i> candidate	<i>FSRQC</i>	3444	1799	1135	1011	913	717	109	81
Blazar of unknown type	<i>BCU</i>	2503	1241	849	766	712	357	253	104
Blazar candidate of unknown type	<i>BCUC</i>	82873	33918	3305	2507	1892	1457	145	91
Total		100368	41936	8117	6852	5865	3668	1273	481

Notes. N_{tot} and N_{eRASS1} : number of sources contained in the BLAZE catalog across the entire sky and in the western Galactic hemisphere, respectively. $N_{\text{match},15}$ and $N_{\text{match},8}$: Number of *eROSITA* sources within 15'' and 8'' of a BLAZE catalog source. N_{sample} : final number of *eROSITA* counterparts after accounting for the detection likelihood and quality flags. N_{new} : Number of sources of each class with no previous exposure time with *XMM-Newton*, *Chandra*, *ASCA*, *NuSTAR*, *Suzaku*, *Swift*-XRT, and *ROSAT* pointed observations. N_{spec} : Number of sources with $N > 50$ counts, for which X-ray spectral analysis is possible. $N_{\text{spec,new}}$: Number of sources from the spectroscopic sub-sample without prior X-ray data available.

ected by *eROSITA* and associated with “gold sample” BLAZE sources as the *eROSITA* observed blazars, while we will name *eROSITA* matches with an entry from the BLAZE “silver sample” the *eROSITA* observed blazar candidates. The 2252 objects removed from the catalog are included in a separate catalog, as this sample is expected to be less pure, but may be of value for follow-up studies. Due to the survey mode of *eROSITA*, we are able to obtain a view unbiased by variability, source luminosity and only limited by *eROSITA* sensitivity variations and exposure in eRASS1.

3.1.2. Validation of positional matching

Since our association of blazars with *eROSITA* sources is based on positions, it is necessary to check whether our positional matching is a valid approach. We use two independent methods to derive an upper limit on the possible contamination of matching by pure chance.

We first estimate the possibility of randomly associating an input position with an eRASS1 source by uniformly distributing 5×10^5 (which is five times larger but has the same order of magnitude in numbers as the BLAZE catalog) sources at random position on the entire sky and matching these positions to the eRASS1 catalog. Within 8'', we find 346 matches whereas, within 15'' 1205 matches are found, indicating a probability for random association of 0.07% and 0.24% for these separations, respectively. Alternatively, conserving the density properties of

the eRASS1 survey we rotate the positions in the eRASS1 catalog around the ecliptic poles by a few degrees in ecliptic longitude and then match them with the BLAZE catalog. For rotations by 1° and 10°, 89 and 104 sources match within 15'', respectively. When reducing the separation to 8'', only 34 and 23 matches remain, implying a random match probability of about 0.08% for a separation of < 8'', regardless of the applied rotation.

Results from both methods suggest a probability below 0.1% of accidental source confusion. Hence, we expect at most 42 *eROSITA* detections to be randomly assigned to BLAZE catalog sources. Given the size of the BlazEr1 catalog, the rate of source confusion is therefore at a negligible level of 0.7%. Our cross-matching angular distance is well justified, as the loss of matches when reducing the acceptable angular distance from 15'' to 8'' indicates that the probability of including random matches drops significantly. We emphasize that this low level of accidental source confusion is due to us using pre-existing positions of objects with known multiwavelength properties, including a very high probability that these sources are X-ray bright. This approach is different from approaches that attempt to find multiwavelength counterparts for new X-ray detected sources in multiwavelength catalogs, where little is known about the properties. These approaches have a much higher probability of misidentifying the multiwavelength counterparts.




Fig. 2. Histograms of angular separation between BLAZE catalog and *eROSITA* positions (green) with the distribution of the matched *eROSITA* source positional uncertainty overlaid (yellow). The vertical line at 8'' indicates the distance threshold for the final sample. The cumulative distribution of the angular separation is shown in blue. **a** Sample of *eROSITA* observed blazars with 93% of the matches found within 8'', and 55% and 79% within 3'' and 5'', respectively. **b** *eROSITA* observed blazar candidates. Only 81% of matches are within 8'', and 31%/58% within 3''/5''. We show Rayleigh distributions (black) for illustrative purposes, calculated following Merloni et al. (2024; Eq. 3, assuming $F = 0.8$).

3.2. Contamination

The sample size makes a study of the source nature on an individual basis too time consuming. We therefore, try to assess upper limits of the contamination. We derive the level of contamination caused by non-blazars in the sample by comparing the BlazEr1 catalog with the catalog of Legacy Survey data release 10 (LS10; Dey et al. 2019) counterparts of eRASS1 point sources (Salvato et al. 2025; hereafter S25). This catalog is based on an identification of optical counterparts with the Bayesian algorithm NWAY (Salvato et al. 2018), using a combination of astrometric information such as separation, positional error, and source number density (similar to Xmatch; Pineau et al. 2017). The completeness and purity of the LS10 catalog of counterparts to eRASS1 is ~93% (S25).

We match by using the detection ID of eRASS1. If more than one possible counterpart is listed for a given ID, we use the one with the closest position. In total, we can match 84% of the BlazEr1 sources (4924 objects). We only consider counterparts to be a match between both catalogs if the association of S25 and the BlazEr1 catalog have an angular separation of at most 2'',




Fig. 3. Positions of the BlazEr1 sources in Galactic coordinates. The different colors and symbols indicate the blazar types in the catalog. Candidates, especially *BCUCs*, dominate the sample. The overdensity along $l \sim 240^\circ$ coincides with the footprint of BROS. Confirmed blazars are displayed by filled symbols, candidates are shown in the same color without filling. All following figures will adapt the same color and symbol scheme.

and if $p_{\text{any}} \geq 0.1$ ³. For 508 matches (10.3% of the sources with a match based on detection ID) we associate a different counterpart as S25 or p_{any} is very low. About 89% of the disagreed upon objects are associated with blazar candidates and almost 80% originate from the BROS catalog. This leaves us with 4416 counterparts in common, which corresponds to a 90% agreement. Therefore, when comparing with the results of S25 and assuming that their assigned counterparts to the *eROSITA* sources are all correct, a disagreement between the counterpart by S25 and our catalog and hence a contamination of at maximum 3.3% for the *eROSITA* observed blazars and 14.0% for the *eROSITA* observed blazar candidates is expected. Sometimes the X-ray source might be the sum of multiple emitters. This is the case for 32 sources, of which in 22 cases the counterparts by S25 and our source are identical. We also compare the matches obtained by matching the *unverified* BLAZE catalog with eRASS1, using the same methodology as for the BlazEr1 sample, with the counterpart catalog. Given the same criteria as listed in Sect. 3.1, the *unverified* BLAZE catalog has 491 matches with the eRASS1, of which 397 have a counterpart in S25. For 33 of these matches, all of them candidates, S25 assigns a different counterpart. Therefore, a slightly lower but similar level (~ 8%) of contamination is reached for this low quality sample as for the BlazEr1 catalog. This also indicates that cleaning of the BLAZE catalog is useful.

For all *eROSITA* sources listed in the BlazEr1 and the counterpart catalog, we compare the angular separation between the *eROSITA* position and the counterpart by S25 with the separation between the BLAZE catalog source and *eROSITA*, normalized

³ p_{any} is the probability given by NWAY that any of the matches found is the correct counterpart.

by the positional uncertainty of *eROSITA*. Some BlazEr1 counterparts tend to be too far away as they lie significantly above the theoretical Rayleigh distribution, whereas few counterparts assigned by S25 seem to be closer or more distant than expected (see Fig. A.2). This indicates that some BLAZE catalog objects are erroneously associated to the *eROSITA* source or that some of the associations of S25 might not be the correct counterpart. The estimated number of contaminating sources based on the assumption that S25 provides the correct counterpart and disagreement indicates contamination therefore represents an upper limit. We also note that ours and Salvato et al.'s counterpart associations methodologies differ significantly. While we focus on selecting blazar specific objects using multiwavelength information and pre-existing catalogs, Salvato et al.'s approach has been fine-tuned towards general X-ray emitters, where non-jetted AGN dominate the population of X-ray emitting extragalactic objects. However, an in-depth comparison between the approaches is beyond the scope of this paper.

The contamination is mainly driven by the BLAZE catalog selection function and not by random matches (see Sect. 3.1.2). The most pessimistic estimates from the purities of the input catalogs (see Sect. 2.2) and the comparisons with the counterpart catalog indicate that the contamination for confirmed blazars is at most 5%, and $\sim 14\%$ for the candidate blazars. The limit for the confirmed blazars is based on the purity estimate of the BZCAT by Xie et al. (2024), which has the highest impurity of the confirmed blazar catalogs. Although sources are excluded from the BLAZE catalog based on Xie et al. (2024), they do not provide a classification for all catalog entries. We therefore expect the subsample not covered by Xie et al. (2024) in the BZCAT to have a similar level of contamination as the overall catalog, and since we do not have information available for all BZCAT objects we adapt the 5% limit as an upper limit for the entire sample of confirmed blazars. For the candidates the limit is based on the contamination estimate based on the comparison with S25. Therefore, at most 106 of the thought to be confirmed blazars and 527 of the candidates are non-blazars. In total, less than 11% of the BlazEr1 catalog is contaminated, corresponding to a purity of almost 90%.

3.3. Survey sensitivity

Since the sensitivity of the *eROSITA* survey is not uniform across the sky, it is crucial to determine the lowest flux sources that could have been detected as a function of position and exposure time. We use the official *eROSITA* mission simulator, SIXTE (Dauser et al. 2019) to determine this sensitivity limit. Using the as-flown *eROSITA* attitude of the first all-sky survey and a diffuse foreground from ROSAT, we simulate *eROSITA* observations of 10^5 sources randomly and uniformly distributed across the western Galactic hemisphere. Based on the expected blazar spectrum averaged across the entire population, each source is assigned an absorbed power law spectrum ($\Gamma_X = 2.0$, $N_H = 1 \times 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-2}$). We vary the 0.2–2.3 keV flux between 1×10^{-16} and $1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, with 20000 random flux values per flux decade. The simulated data are then sorted into event lists for each *eROSITA* sky tile and processed using the official source detection pipeline contained in the *eROSITA* data analysis software eSASS (version 211214, Predehl et al. 2021; Brunner et al. 2022; Merloni et al. 2024). The processing yields a mock catalog containing information on the detection likelihood, exposure times, and fluxes. To ensure the validity of the simulations, we checked that all fluxes of the detected source are consistent with




Fig. 4. Sky area in which 95% of all sources above a minimum flux will be detected with $\text{DET_LIKE}_0 \geq 10$. The dashed line indicates the total area of the western Galactic hemisphere. The red line displays the sensitivity over the entire western Galactic hemisphere, while the blue line shows the extragalactic sky excluding an area of 15° below and above the Galactic plane and regions with radii of 5.5° around the Large Magellanic cloud (LMC) and 3.0° around the Small Magellanic cloud (SMC).

the input values within uncertainties; and since this is the case we use the input fluxes.

To estimate the completeness and sensitivity, we define the survey as complete if, for a given exposure time and minimum detection likelihood of 10, 95% of sources with a given flux are detected. For a given minimum detection likelihood, we find that we can approximate the minimum detectable flux by

$$F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV},\min} = I_{\text{sens}} \times \left(\frac{t_{\text{expo}} - t_0}{1 \text{ s}} \right)^{-\Gamma_{\text{sens}}} + F_0, \quad (1)$$

where for the given minimum $\text{DET_LIKE}_0 = 10$, $I_{\text{sens}} = 2.14 \times 10^{-9} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, $t_0 = -13.90 \text{ s}$, $\Gamma_{\text{sens}} = 2.20$, and $F_0 = 2.02 \times 10^{-14} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Combining Eq. (1) with the *eROSITA* exposure map, we can determine the area of the sky at which the survey is sensitive to a specific flux. We divide the sky into equally-sized pixels with an area of 0.002 deg^2 and determine the minimum flux within that pixel. Figure 4 shows that the survey is complete on the whole western sky down to a flux of $F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} \sim 2 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. For all sources with a lower flux, corrections using the derived sensitivity will have to be applied, for instance when deriving log N -log S -distributions.

3.4. X-ray spectral analysis

In order to gather information on the X-ray properties of our sample, we complement the available eRASS1 catalog data (Merloni et al. 2024) with spectral information, using eSASS version 211214, HEASOFT version 6.30, and *eROSITA* event processing version 020, which offers improved calibration compared to the release version 010 used by Merloni et al. (2024). While the processing version affects the quality of spectral products, it does not affect the source detection itself within the

conservative selection criteria applied above. Tests with different processing versions reveal that their influence on the overall spectral fitting results does not change the overall results. We extract source spectra from circular extraction regions centered on each catalog source, scaling the extraction region radius, R , on the maximum likelihood count rate for the 0.2–2.3 keV band, given by Merloni et al. (2024),

$$R = N \times (\text{ML_RATE_1 [cts/s]})^\gamma \quad (2)$$

where $N = 85''/443$ and $\gamma = 0.284$. Higher count rate sources require larger regions in order to include all source photons, however we require at least $23''$ and at maximum a region with a radius of $200''$. Background regions are annuli centered on the source position, using Eq. 2 to scale the inner and outer radius. Specifically, for the inner radius we set $N = 181''/963$, $\gamma = 0.242$, $R_{\text{inner,min}} = 54''$, and $R_{\text{inner,max}} = 350''$. For the outer radius, $N = 1063''/211$, $\gamma = 0.282$, $R_{\text{outer,min}} = 280''$, and $R_{\text{outer,max}} = 2200''$. Within the background region we exclude all neighboring eRASS1 sources, scaling the exclusion radius of each source by their count rate. Spectra are then extracted from event lists with the eSASS task `srctool`. Since eROSITA TM 5 and 7 are affected by light leaks (Predehl et al. 2021; Merloni et al. 2024), these two modules require special treatment in our analysis. Unless mentioned otherwise, for these TMs, only data taken >1 keV were considered. For spectral analysis, we use the Interactive Spectral Interpretation System (ISIS, version 1.6.2; Houck & Denicola 2000) and quote all uncertainties at 90% confidence for one independent parameter, unless stated otherwise.

For all sources, we collect basic source information such as the total amount of source counts and on-axis exposure times. Count information is given as the number of photons detected by all TMs for the 0.2–2.3 keV band, or as the combination of counts measured between 1.0–10.0 keV for TMs 5 and 7 and 0.2–10.0 keV for all other TMs. We utilize the Bayesian approach of Park et al. (2006) to determine hardness ratios,

$$\text{HR} = \frac{N_{\text{Ha}} - N_{\text{So}}}{N_{\text{Ha}} + N_{\text{So}}}, \quad (3)$$

, where N_{So} and N_{Ha} are the counts in the softer and harder band, respectively, and their uncertainties. We ignore TMs 5 and 7, and use the energy bands 0.2–0.7 keV, 0.7–1.2 keV, and 1.2–5.0 keV, hereafter bands 1, 2, and 3. For an absorbed power law with $N_{\text{H}} = 1 \times 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and photon index $\Gamma_{\text{X}} = 2$, these bands contain a similar number of photons. The different hardness ratios are designated as follows: HR12 is the hardness calculated using bands 1 and 2, HR23 uses bands 2 and 3, and HR13 bands 1 and 3.

The source fluxes reported in the eRASS1 catalogs are determined as part of the eROSITA source detection pipeline. They are based on maximum likelihood methods, applying pre-determined energy conversion factors assuming an absorbed power law with $\Gamma_{\text{X}} = 2.0$ and an absorption column density of $N_{\text{H}} = 3 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. We determine source intrinsic fluxes for the 0.2–2.3 keV band based on spectral modeling with fixed parameters. We use simple absorbed power laws `tbabs*powerlaw` (`tbabs(1)*powerlaw(1)`), with the abundances of Wilms et al. (2000) and the cross-sections of Verner et al. (1996) and fix the equivalent hydrogen column, N_{H} , to the 21 cm value for the source position reported by the HI4PI Collaboration (2016). We then determine the 0.2–2.3 keV fluxes from fits of the spectral continuum to the full eROSITA energy range from 0.2 keV (1 keV for TM5 and 7) to 10.0 keV for four fixed photon indices, Γ_{X} , covering the range expected from blazar-like spectra $\Gamma_{\text{X}} = \{1.5, 1.7, 2.0, 2.3\}$.




Fig. 5. Spectral fits of an absorbed power law model for three confirmed blazars with different fluxes. For 5BZQ J0547–6728, no prior X-ray observations are available. The three lower panels display the fit residuals for each source. Data from TM5 and 7 are displayed in a lighter color.

For the 1273 sources with more than 50 counts detected in the 0.2–2.3 keV band, we also perform a more detailed spectral analysis, again using an absorbed power law. For these, we dynamically rebin each spectrum following Kaastra & Bleeker (2016), while requiring that each bin contains at least one count, leave the photon index free, and fix N_{H} to the 21 cm value from the HI4PI Collaboration (2016). Spectral minimization is based on Cash statistics (Cash 1979; Kaastra 2017). Figure 5 shows the spectra of three blazars with our best fit model. The fluxes derived from the fixed photon index power law fits, those determined during the spectral fits, and the ones reported by Merloni et al. (2024) are all similar within $\sim 18\%$. For high fluxes ($\geq F_{\text{X},0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} \sim 10^{-11} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; Merloni et al. 2024) eROSITA spectra are influenced by pileup (see, e.g., König et al. 2022); we proceeded to check for pile-up in these sources. Using SIXTE to simulate blazar-like spectra within different flux ranges (also above the flux limit reported by Merloni et al. 2024) we find that our spectra are not significantly affected by pileup, with a maximum pileup fraction of 1.79% for the brightest source.

4. Additional multiwavelength data

In order to put the properties of the BlazEr1 catalog into the multiwavelength context of these sources, we supplement the eROSITA information with data from other X-ray and multi-wavelength catalogs.

4.1. Observations of eROSITA blazars with other X-ray missions

To collect soft X-ray flux and spectral information, we cross-match the BlazEr1 with the *ROSAT* (0.1–2.4 keV, [Boller et al. 2016](#)) and the *Swift*-XRT (0.3–10.0 keV) source catalogs by [Giommi et al. \(2019\)](#); OUSXB DR3) and [Evans et al. \(2020\)](#). Although both catalogs use *Swift*-XRT, they were compiled independently and using different approaches. The OUSXB catalog specifically targets blazars and treats each single observation separately, whereas [Evans et al. \(2020\)](#) merge all exposures of a given target. BlazEr1 counterparts are again identified by positional cross-matching, using a maximum angular separation between the BlazEr1 position and *ROSAT* of 40'' and of 8'' between BlazEr1 and *Swift*-XRT. We find 1496 *ROSAT* and 1249 *Swift*-XRT (for [Evans et al. 2020](#)) counterparts. As the OUSXB catalog is built on an observation basis with one entry per observation, we first match it with the BLAZE catalog. For each of the 1039 matches we then derive the mean, median, minimum, and maximum fluxes and spectral indices from all source visits.

In order to get information at higher energies, we cross-match the BlazEr1 with the *NuSTAR* (3.0–10.0 keV, 10.0–30.0 keV) blazar catalog ([Middei et al. 2022](#)), using a maximum angular separation of 8'' (based on the positional accuracy of *NuSTAR*; [Harrison et al. 2013](#)), identifying 46 out of 126 sources. Since this catalog contains one entry per observation, we include the fluxes and spectral information of the observation closest in time to eRASS1 to the BlazEr1 catalog. We also matched our detections with the *Swift*-BAT catalog (14.0–195.0 keV, [Lien et al. 2025](#)), assuming a maximum angular separation of 60'', and where available using the positions of already known counterparts, obtaining 96 matches, for which we add the flux and spectral information to the BlazEr1.

To identify objects with previous observations, we cross-match BlazEr1 with the observation catalogs of *XMM-Newton*, *Chandra*, *ASCA*, *NuSTAR*, *Suzaku*, *Swift*-XRT, and *ROSAT* available at HEASARC⁴. BlazEr1 contains the total exposure time for each source and mission.

4.2. The γ -ray counterparts of eROSITA blazars

The Large Area Telescope (LAT; [Atwood et al. 2009](#)) onboard the *Fermi* Gamma-ray Space Telescope (0.1–100.0 GeV, 1.0–100.0 GeV) has been observing the entire sky in the γ -ray band since 2008. We use the γ -ray counterparts from the fourth data release of the *Fermi*-LAT Fourth Source catalog (4FGL-DR4; [Abdollahi et al. 2020, 2022](#)) listed in the BLAZE catalog, in total obtaining 1293 matches. We additionally collect flux and spectral information, source classifications, and SED peak positions provided by the third data release of the Fourth Catalog of Active Galactic Nuclei Detected by *Fermi*-LAT (4LAC-DR3; [Ajello et al. 2020, 2022](#)). For the comparison with the 4LAC catalog we use a positional match between the BlazEr1 catalog and the position of the associated counterparts listed in the catalog

with a maximum separation of 1''⁵, since it is based on an older 4FGL version as the one used for this paper.

4.3. Radio counterparts to eROSITA blazars

We search for radio counterparts using Very Long Baseline Interferometry (VLBI) programs, since this implies that all flux densities are representative for the beamed compact jet rather than extended lobe emission. Counterparts from the Radio Fundamental Catalog (RFC, version rfc_2023c, [Petrov & Kovalev 2025](#))⁶ are identified using a maximum angular separation of 1'', since radio positional uncertainties are low. We find 2620 matches. Additionally, we cross-match the BlazEr1 catalog with the blazars covered by the TANAMI (8.4 GHz, 59 sources; [Ojha et al. 2010](#); [Müller et al. 2018](#)) and MOJAVE (15 GHz, 407 sources [Lister et al. 2021](#); [Homan et al. 2021](#)) surveys. We use the flux density values that are already public, since an extensive investigation involving the more current data is beyond the scope of this paper. With a separation of at most 1'' we find 52 TANAMI and 97 MOJAVE blazars within the BlazEr1 catalog. We assume flux density uncertainties of 5% for RFC ([Petrov & Kovalev 2025](#)) and MOJAVE ([Homan et al. 2002](#); [Lister et al. 2021](#)), and 20% for TANAMI ([Ojha et al. 2010](#)).

4.4. Infrared and optical counterparts to eROSITA sources

We gather counterpart optical and mid-infrared data (bands: g (4686 Å), r (6165 Å), i (7481 Å), z (8931 Å), W1 (3.4 μ m), W2 (4.6 μ m), W3 (12 μ m), and W4 (22 μ m)) from S25. Additionally, the catalog provides the publicly available spectroscopic redshifts from [Kluge et al. \(2024\)](#), photometric redshifts for AGN computed with CIRCLEZ ([Saxena et al. 2024](#)), and other multiwavelength information. *Gaia* information is also contained in the catalog from S25, however, the astrometric data are not used here since the proper motions and parallaxes listed for the brightest and well studied blazars (such as 3C 273) would indicate a Galactic origin, which also enters the Galactic/extragalactic classification in S25. This error in *Gaia* is associated with the variability of these objects ([Khamitov et al. 2022](#)). We only use the data for the 4416 sources where the BlazEr1 and the S25 catalogs agree with each other on the eRASS1 counterpart (for details, see Sect. 3.2).

In order to obtain reliable redshifts for population studies we augment the BLAZE and BlazEr1 catalogs with redshifts given in the HighZ sample (Sbarrato et al., in prep., [Marcotulli et al. 2025](#)) and the 4LAC ([Ajello et al. 2022](#)). If no redshift is given in these two catalogs we extend the catalogs to using un-flagged redshifts from the BZCAT (redshifts not considered to be spurious by [Massaro et al. 2015](#)), confirmed and reliable redshifts from the 3HSP ([Chang et al. 2019](#)), and redshifts from CGRaBS ([Healey et al. 2008](#)), VERONCAT ([Véron-Cetty & Véron 2010](#)), SIMBAD ([Wenger et al. 2000](#)) and spectroscopic redshifts from S25, prioritizing redshifts in the order of catalogs listed here. For the high-redshift source BROS J1322.1–1323 we use the redshift reported by [Belladitta et al. \(2025\)](#), where the eRASS1 counterpart given in the BlazEr1 catalog has been previously reported.

⁵ This leads to seven candidates having 4LAC parameter values as well, however, given the size of the catalog these data points can be ignored and do not influence our results in any way.

⁶ <http://astrogeo.org/rfc/>, covering the S (2.2–2.4 GHz), C (4.1–5.0 GHz), X (7.3–8.8 GHz), U (15.2–15.5 GHz), and K (22.0–24.2 GHz) bands

⁴ <https://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/W3Browse/w3browse.pl>

4.5. Broadband spectral indices

We calculate an estimated spectral index for a power law between different SED bands (e.g., [Stocke et al. 1991](#); [Perlman et al. 1996a](#); [Giommi et al. 1999](#); [Turriziani et al. 2007](#)),

$$S = N \times E^{-\alpha}, \quad (4)$$

such that the slope, α , between two bands characterized by reference energies E_i and E_j is

$$\alpha_{ij} = -\frac{\log S_i - \log S_j}{\log E_i - \log E_j}, \quad (5)$$

where $S_i = S(E_i)$ and $S_j = S(E_j)$ are the flux densities at a specific energy (E_i, E_j). For the X-rays we use the 1 keV flux density found from power law fits with $\Gamma_X = 2.0$ and a fixed value of N_H , since this flux estimate is available for all catalog sources. We computed $\alpha_{X\gamma}$ based on the 0.1–100 GeV γ -ray flux from [Abdollahi et al. \(4FGL-DR4; 2022\)](#), assuming the geometric mean between the energy band boundaries as reference energy $(0.1 \text{ GeV} \times 100.0 \text{ GeV})^{1/2}$. For values of α_{RX} we utilized the dereddened W1-band flux, whereas for α_{OX} we used the dereddened LS10 r-band flux, both based on the transmission and flux values taken from S25. We account for the uncertainty of dust models in the dereddening (according to [Fitzpatrick 1999](#)) by applying a 20% systematic uncertainty to our estimate for the transmission. This estimate is based on the different transmission factors obtained when assuming $R_V = 2.7$ or $R_V = 3.1$ in the extinction law. We also provide a set values of α_{RX} , determined using the RFC X-band (8.6 GHz), TANAMI (8.4 GHz; [Ojha et al. 2010](#); [Müller et al. 2018](#)) and MOJAVE (15 GHz; [Lister et al. 2021](#); [Homan et al. 2021](#)) flux densities. Uncertainties for the α -values were estimated using Gaussian error propagation and 68% confidence intervals.

5. The BlazEr1 catalog results and discussion

The steps outlined in Sects. 3 and 4 lead to the construction of the BlazEr1 catalog. We also performed the same steps for objects which do not match our selection criteria (Sect. 3.1.1). These discarded sources are included in a supplementary catalog (see Appendix D for the catalog description). This sample – referred to as the *unverified* sample – contains 2252 objects, which we provide as a courtesy, but do not discuss further.

In this section, we discuss the main BlazEr1 results, focusing first on *eROSITA* X-ray results, and then presenting the multi-wavelength picture. We also address non-detected sources here.

5.1. Global properties of the BlazEr1 catalog

The BlazEr1 catalog contains 5865 individual blazars and blazar candidates observed and detected with *eROSITA*. Of these, 2106 are associated with a confirmed blazar, while the remaining are blazar candidates. We detect roughly the same number of sources for each blazar subtype, with 597 *BLLs*, 769 *FSRQs* and 712 *BCUs*, and also find 28 *BZGs*. The blazar candidates are dominated by *BCUCs* (1892 sources, $\sim 50\%$ of the candidates), while the remainder is composed of 25% *BLLCs* and 24% *FSRQCs* (954 and 913, respectively). The origin of the *BCUC* population is dominated by the BROS catalog. The sky map (Fig. 3) shows a roughly evenly distributed extragalactic distribution of objects. There are 5296 sources at Galactic latitudes $|b| > 15^\circ$, corresponding to an area density of 0.346 sources/deg².




Fig. 6. Distribution of source counts with its cumulative distribution shown by the solid line curve. The dashed vertical line marks the threshold of 50 counts, above which we deem a spectral analysis meaningful. Only 20% of all sources are above this limit, while about half have fewer than 20 counts, as shown by the cumulative distribution (blue).

In total, the catalog is based on 487030 X-ray photons in the 0.2–2.3 keV band. Most sources in the catalog have very few counts (median value: 18 counts; see Fig. 6). During eRASS1, *eROSITA* detected more than 50 counts per source for about 20% of the BlazEr1 objects (i.e., 1273 sources), which we select for a spectral analysis. 4FGL J0543.9–5531 has the most counts with 26819 counts. This source has flux of $F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} = 4.9 \times 10^{-11} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which is increased by a factor of about two ($F_{X,0.3-10.0 \text{ keV}} = 4.5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; [Giommi et al. 2019](#)) to six ($F_{X,0.1-2.4 \text{ keV}} = 9.0 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ [Massaro et al. 2015](#)) compared to past observations. The long exposure time of 584 s, given the position of the source, explains the high number of counts compared to equally bright sources. About half of the detections have fewer than 20 counts, with some being registered with only three counts in the *eROSITA* main band (0.2–2.3 keV).

A vital characteristic of the sample is the sources' flux distribution. Unless stated otherwise, for consistency and as not to mix different flux determination methods and since we do not expect robust spectral fitting to be possible for the majority of sources (< 50 counts), we study the properties of the blazar population in this section using the unabsorbed source intrinsic flux in the 0.2–2.3 keV band measured assuming a fixed photon index of $\Gamma_X = 2.0$ and the 21 cm N_H at the source position. We use fluxes assuming $\Gamma_X = 2.0$ since this is the expected photon index obtained when averaging across the entire population. Fluxes determined with other values for a fixed photon index ($\Gamma_X = \{1.5, 1.7, 2.3\}$) agree to within 9.1%. The fluxes from the eRASS1 catalog ([Merloni et al. 2024](#)) are consistent within the uncertainties, with an average deviation of 18%, which might be due to the different treatment of absorption and flux determination (on average the N_H from the [HI4PI Collaboration \(2016\)](#) is higher than the one assumed by [Merloni et al. 2024](#)). The measured fluxes span a range of almost four decades; the brightest source is 3C 273 (4FGL J1229.0+0202, $F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} = 6.2 \times 10^{-11} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, with an exposure time of 111 s and 7179 counts), the faintest is W1BRS J045646.58–585411.7 ($F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} = 6.9 \times 10^{-15} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, with an exposure of 867 s and 13 counts).




Fig. 7. Flux distribution in the BlazEr1 catalog. The majority of sources have fluxes below the survey completeness limit on the western Galactic hemisphere, the vertical line marks this limit. The cumulative distribution is shown in blue.

About half of the sources in the BlazEr1 catalog are brighter than the flux level where completeness is reached across the western Galactic hemisphere, $F_{X,0.2-2.3\text{ keV}} = 2 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (see Sect. 3.3 and Fig. 7). Fainter sources are located in parts of the sky where *eROSITA* has deeper exposure.

Reliable redshifts z , are available for 3627 catalog objects (Fig. 8). Including the S25 photometric redshifts increases the number of available values to 4795. The majority of blazars and blazar candidates are found at $z < 2$. The sample contains 155 sources with $z \geq 2.5$, including objects up to $z \sim 6$, such as the high-redshift blazar candidate BROS J1322.1–1323 (Beldi et al. 2025; $z = 4.71$). Among these $z \geq 2.5$ sources, we report the first X-ray detection of the blazar 5BZQ J1007+1356, which was identified as a γ -ray emitter by Kreter et al. (2020) during an a posteriori search for transient γ -ray signals from high- z blazars. Out of the 87 blazars on the western Galactic hemisphere studied by Kreter et al. (2020), *eROSITA* detects 61 sources. Consistent with previous results (Ajello et al. 2012, 2014, 2020), the observed distribution of redshifts indicates that *BLLs* tend to be at low z , while *FSRQs* peak towards $z \sim 1.0$. *BCUs* can be found at all redshifts.

Several remarkable *eROSITA*-detected blazars located in the early Universe are not part of BlazEr1. *eRASSU* J020916–562650 is one of the most distant blazars known ($z = 5.6$; Wolf et al. 2024), but was not detected in *eRASS1*, only in subsequent surveys in *eRASS2*, *eRASS3*, and *eRASS4* (the name of the source deviates from the name used by Wolf et al. 2024). The $z = 6.19$ quasar CFHQS J142952+544717, which was detected in the first *eROSITA* survey (Medvedev et al. 2020), is located on the eastern Galactic hemisphere. Recent observations with *Chandra* and *NuSTAR* revealed rapid variability, identifying it as a likely blazar (Marcotulli et al. 2025). Similarly, the blazars TXS 1508+572 ($z = 4.3$) and GB6 1428+4217 ($z = 4.7$), which have shown remarkably luminous γ -ray flaring events in recent years (Gokus et al. 2024a; Gokus et al. 2025), are also located on the eastern Galactic hemisphere.

In order to assess the quality of the photometric redshifts by S25 we compare them to the reliable literature (spectroscopic and photometric from, for instance, the BZCAT or 4LAC catalogs) redshifts where both parameters are available. For almost




Fig. 8. Redshift distribution of BlazEr1 sources. The colors represent different sub-types. All BlazEr1 entries are shown in green (3627 sources), *BLLs* in blue, and *FSRQs* in orange. The inset shows the distribution for sources with $z > 3.5$.

67% of the sources the difference in redshift is $> 10\%$. We therefore limit our population study involving distance-dependent properties (such as e.g., luminosity) to objects with reliable literature redshifts and omit the photometric redshifts of S25.

5.2. Luminosity distributions of *eROSITA* detected blazars

We derive rest-frame luminosities for the 0.2–2.3 keV band, $L_{X,0.2-2.3\text{ keV}}$ ⁷. Not surprisingly, the luminosity of the detected blazars increases with redshift, and the catalog is also biased towards higher luminosities due to the flux limit while sampling a larger volume. This bias becomes evident when comparing with other missions (see Fig 9). The *NuSTAR* sample of Middei et al. (2022) tends to contain sources with higher luminosities and fluxes, covering similar values as *eROSITA*. Additionally, with the *NuSTAR* sample it can be seen that blazars are highly variable. Due to the lower sensitivity of the *Swift*-BAT sample (Marcotulli et al. 2022), luminosities from that sample are biased towards high luminosities, as only high-flux sources are part of this sample. The comparison with these hard X-ray samples indicates that *eROSITA* samples intermediate luminosities between the shallow all-sky hard X-ray samples and deeper surveys, and also extends to higher redshifts (see above).

The median luminosity for all objects is $L_{X,0.2-2.3\text{ keV}} \sim 7.3 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. Confirmed blazars show slightly higher luminosities, due to a tail towards lower luminosities apparent in the luminosity distributions (Fig. 10). On average *FSRQs* are more luminous by almost an order of magnitude compared to *BLLs* and *BCUs*, which have similar values. The median values for all source subgroups are given in Table 3. Since redshifts are more difficult to determine for *BLLs*, luminosities are available for more *FSRQs* than *BLLs*. The luminosities inferred with *eROSITA* are consistent with previous studies (e.g., Donato et al. 2001; Fan et al. 2012). Overall, luminosities determined for blazar candidates agree with those of confirmed blazars and no stark difference is found between γ -detected and non-detected sources. Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests indicate that most distributions differ significantly at the 95% confidence level, all combinations result

⁷ Since we use $\Gamma_X = 2$, the K -correction to transform to the rest-frame, $(1+z)^{\Gamma_X-2} = 1$ (Langejahn et al. 2020).




Fig. 9. X-ray luminosity as a function of redshift. The different dashed lines display luminosities of sources with $\Gamma_X = 2.0$ for increasing z and a fixed X-ray flux: from top (dashed line) to bottom (dash-double dot line), we display $F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}}$ from $10^{-11} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ down to $10^{-14} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ in steps of 10. We show the main band *eROSITA* luminosity in panel **a**, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3; and the 2–10 keV X-ray luminosity in panel **b**. In gray the BlazEr1 sample is shown. Orange points are based on *NuSTAR* data (Middei et al. 2022), blue points on *Swift*-BAT (Marcotulli et al. 2022), using the redshifts from BZCAT and 3HSP for the *NuSTAR* and the redshifts from Marcotulli et al. (2022) and adopting their best fit models.

in a p -value below 0.05, with the exception of the *BCU* and *BLL* distributions, which likely have the same underlying distribution (95%, p -value of 0.09). This result is consistent with previous re-

Table 3. Characterization of the distribution of luminosities in BlazEr1. We list the quartiles for luminosities $L_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}}$, in units of $10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ for the different classes of blazars.

Population	1. quartile	2. quartile	3. quartile
All	0.21	0.73	2.17
Confirmed	0.18	0.74	2.57
Candidates	0.23	0.72	1.89
<i>FSRQ</i>	0.83	2.17	5.00
<i>BLL</i>	0.09	0.33	1.19
<i>BCU</i>	0.11	0.28	0.86
<i>FSRQC</i>	0.67	1.28	2.48
<i>BLLC</i>	0.10	0.21	0.58
<i>BCUC</i>	0.27	0.86	2.19




Fig. 10. Luminosity distribution for all sources with reliable redshifts. The panels show distributions for different subgroups of the *eROSITA* blazars and *eROSITA* blazar candidates, with vertical lines indicating the median luminosity for each subgroup (see Table 3).

sults which hinted that most *BCUs* are *BLLs* (Kang et al. 2019; Peña-Herazo et al. 2020; Chiaro et al. 2021).

The low-energy peak frequencies of the LSPs (as identified in the 4LAC) increase with decreasing luminosity. For HSPs and ISPs no significant trend is observed. This observation is consistent with the origin of the X-rays within the SED coming from different processes, and with the blazar sequence.

5.3. Hardness Ratios

In Fig. 11 we show the distribution of hardness ratios (see Sect. 3.4 for the definition) based on the source counts of the BlazEr1 objects. The hardness ratio diagrams highlight the dif-




Fig. 11. Scatter plot of hardness ratios between energy bands 1 (0.2–0.7 keV), 2 (0.7–1.2 keV), and 3 (1.2–5.0 keV). Sources with ≥ 50 counts are shown in the color scheme of Fig. 3, fainter sources in gray. These sources show a higher dispersion and larger uncertainties. Dotted lines show, from top to bottom, expected hardness ratios for photon indices $\Gamma_X = 1.0$, $\Gamma_X = 2.0$, and $\Gamma_X = 3.0$. The absorption increases along the tracks towards the upper right corner. The majority of source hardnesses are consistent with power law spectra in the expected range of spectral shapes due to the large uncertainties. The black data point in the upper left corners displays the median uncertainties.




Fig. 12. Probability distribution of photon indices for different types of *eROSITA* observed blazars and blazar candidates. The distribution takes into account the uncertainties of individual measurements of the photon index.

ference in spectral properties among the blazar classes, revealing softer spectra for *BLLs* (blue) in comparison to *FSRQs* (red). The obtained hardness ratios have values expected if sources have absorbed power law spectra. Sources in Fig. 11 cluster towards the left of the diagrams and the tracks, therefore most objects are consistent with lower N_H , as expected for the blazar population.

5.4. Photon indices

For the 1273 blazars with ≥ 50 counts, more detailed information about the spectral shape is available from our spectral fits (Sect. 3.4). Figure 12 shows probability distributions of the photon indices of all of these sources as well as for the various subclasses, taking into account the (sometimes large) uncertainties of the spectral fits. The distributions are approximately Gaussian; Table 4 lists the results from fitting Gaussian functions to the distributions. In order to see how similar the distributions are, we performed KS-tests on all the possible combinations, requiring a 95% confidence level. In some cases subsamples from the BlazEr1 catalog are likely to have the same underlying distribution and we list the p -values for those. All not listed combinations have different underlying distributions ($p < 0.05$).

The distribution of X-ray photon indices of the whole sample peaks at around $\Gamma_X = 2.0$. This is observed for the candidates as well, indicating that a sufficient fraction of these candidates have X-ray spectra similar to blazars. A clear separation is seen between *FSRQs* and *BLLs*. Consistent with the blazar sequence (Fossati et al. 1998), *FSRQs* with a higher luminosity peak at lower energies due to more efficient cooling (Ghisellini et al. 1998; see Fig. 12b), resulting in harder X-ray spectra with a higher chance of the emission not being part of the low energy SED peak compared to *BLLs*. *BCUs* are overall similar to all confirmed blazars ($p = 0.707$), confirming their blazar nature. In Fig. 12c, we compare confirmed blazars detected in γ rays to those not detected in γ rays, noting that the distributions are quite similar. We find no difference between sources detected in the 4FGL and the overall (including those from the 4FGL catalog and those not detected in γ rays) distribution of confirmed blazars ($p = 0.429$) or *BCUs* ($p = 0.138$). Confirmed blazars with no γ -ray detection have similar photon indices as the overall candidate distributions ($p = 0.648$), those of the *BLLC* ($= 0.280$) and *BCUC* ($p = 0.589$) classes and the *BCUs* ($p = 0.076$). The distributions of the 4FGL and non-4FGL confirmed blazars do not originate from the same underlying distribution ($p < 0.001$). This is also observed for the *BLLs* ($p = 0.093$) and *BCUs* ($p = 0.972$) sub-classes, however, we find no difference between the γ -ray detected and the non-detected *FSRQs* ($p = 0.008$). Although the X-ray photon indices of γ -ray detected and non- γ -ray detected sources have very similar values, consistent with previous studies (e.g., Yuan & Fan 2014), the comparison of the distribution indicates different distributions, with the exception of *FSRQs*. A possible reason is Compton dominance and the general decoupling of X-rays and γ rays due to the different physical mechanisms. Figure 12d compares the power law slopes of different candidate populations. Although *FSRQCs* exhibit slightly harder spectra, the distributions of *FSRQCs*, *BLLCs* (which is similar to the confirmed distribution $p = 0.705$ and to *BCUs* $p = 0.701$), and *BCUCs* are more similar than for the confirmed objects. The *BCUC* distribution is similar to the other candidate sub-classes ($p = 0.066$ for *BLLCs*, and 0.064 for *FSRQCs*). Potentially this is due to an uncertain source classification. All candidates are similar to the *BLLCs* ($p = 0.198$), and *BCUCs* ($p = 0.893$).

Figure 12e shows the photon index by SED type. LSP blazars tend to have indices below $\Gamma_X \lesssim 2.0$, indicating a rising X-ray spectrum, HSPs have photon indices $\Gamma_X \gtrsim 2.0$, therefore the X-rays are part of the synchrotron peak. ISPs peak around $\Gamma_X \sim 2.0$. We emphasize again that all distributions have a large overlap with each other, indicating again that Γ alone is not a good measure of source type. As expected, *FSRQs* and LSPs have the same underlying photon index distribution ($p = 0.272$),

whereas the HSPs and *BLLs* share similar values ($p = 0.569$), which is also the case for the ISPs ($p = 0.680$), which also exhibit a similar distribution as the HSPs ($p = 0.841$).

It is interesting to compare our average X-ray photon indices for the different blazar types with those derived previously. Table 4 lists a few literature values. Our results are consistent with the previous studies, despite these samples being significantly smaller. Comparing our values to the larger sample by Giommi et al. (2019) we notice that their distributions peak at different positions (Giommi et al. 2019; their Fig. 10); *eROSITA* spectra are slightly softer. We see an overall trend that *FSRQs* and *BLLs* show different spectral slopes, which is also observed in the literature (e.g. Giommi et al. 2019).

In our study, we also observe the split between *FSRQs* and *BLLs* in the distribution of Γ with flux (Fig. 13a). *BLLs* tend to have higher indices as well as higher fluxes, while *FSRQs* tend to show a harder index but extending towards lower fluxes. In the entire sample, we detect no correlation between flux and photon indices for the entire sample or any sub sample with the exception of *BLLs* showing a very weak but statistically significant anticorrelation⁸ (see Table B.1 for correlations coefficients). Figure 13b shows Γ as a function of luminosity. These parameters seem to be anti-correlated, as sources with harder spectra have higher luminosities, a trend already described by Kadler (2005). The anticorrelation is strongest for the *FSRQs*; all other sub samples have less statistically significant anticorrelations and some are not statistically significant at all. This observation is consistent with the blazar sequence, where *FSRQs* tend to have higher luminosities and harder indices, as the X-rays are more likely to originate from inverse Compton emission. *BLLs* tend to display lower luminosities and softer indices, which has already been described in the literature (e.g., Fan et al. 2012). Despite the higher X-ray luminosity of *FSRQs*, the highest observed fluxes ($> 5 \times 10^{-12}$ erg cm⁻² s⁻¹) are almost exclusively from *BLLs* due to their prevalence at lower redshifts. Additionally, the hard spectral index of *FSRQs* makes it easier to detect low-flux *FSRQs*, while *BLLs* with very soft spectra and low fluxes are likely underrepresented due to the detection limits. This indicates a bias in our sample towards high-flux *BLLs*. For *BLLs* no correlation exists between the photon index and the redshift of the source, while for *FSRQs* we find increasingly hard spectra and high luminosities with increasing redshift. A similar observation is made for the *FSRQCs*. These results resemble those of Giommi et al. (2019), and are due to a selection effect.

5.5. The flux-dependent source population of eROSITA blazars

We create log N -log S distributions using fluxes and the sensitivity, giving us the sky area, A , covered at a given limiting flux, F_X (see Sect. 3.3),

$$N(> F_X) = \sum_i \frac{1}{A_i / 1 \text{deg}^2} \quad (6)$$

where areas sensitive to a certain flux level were obtained from the absorbed sensitivity limits of our simulation by correcting


⁸ For the correlation p -values we adapt the following: > 0.10 : correlation does not exist, 0.10 – 0.05 : exists but weak, 0.05 – 0.003 : exists with moderate strength, < 0.003 : exists with high significance, if numbers are orders of magnitude smaller for the high significance we just give the threshold value. If based on the p -value a correlation does not exist or the coefficient is within the range -0.1 and $+0.1$, we do not list the correlation coefficient and p -value. Values are listed in Table B.1.

Table 4. Results of fitting the distributions shown in Fig. 12 with Gaussian distributions. We list the mean values and the standard deviations and values from the literature.

Population	$\langle\Gamma_X\rangle$	σ_{Γ_X}	$\langle\Gamma_{X,\text{Comastri}}\rangle$	$\langle\Gamma_{X,\text{Donato}}\rangle$	$\langle\Gamma_{X,\text{Kadler}}\rangle$	$\langle\Gamma_{X,\text{Giommi}}\rangle$
Reference			1	2	3	4
All	2.05	0.42	-	-	-	-
Confirmed	2.08	0.43	-	-	-	-
Candidates	1.99	0.42	-	-	-	-
<i>BLL</i>	2.26	0.38	2.43 ± 0.21	$2.28 \pm 0.04^*$, $2.39 \pm 0.08^{**}$	$\sim 1.4 - 2.5$	~ 2.0
<i>FSRQ</i>	1.80	0.37	1.67 ± 0.13	1.76 ± 0.06	$1.61 \pm 0.20^{***}$	~ 1.6
<i>BCU</i>	2.08	0.39	-	-	-	-
<i>BLLC</i>	2.07	0.42	-	-	-	-
<i>FSRQC</i>	1.89	0.42	-	-	-	-
<i>BCUC</i>	1.96	0.41	-	-	-	-
4FGL	2.12	0.44	-	-	-	-
Non-4FGL	2.00	0.40	-	-	-	-
HSP	2.28	0.35	-	-	-	-
ISP	2.32	0.39	-	-	-	-
LSP	1.75	0.36	-	-	-	-

Notes. * HBLs, ** LBLs, *** their value for quasars

References. (1) Comastri et al. (1997); (2) Donato et al. (2001); (3) Kadler (2005); (4) Giommi et al. (2019)

**Fig. 13.** Photon index as a function of **a** flux and **b** luminosity, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3 (*BLL(C)s*: blue, *FSRQ(C)s*: red, *BCU(C)s*: orange).

for the absorption used ($N_H = 1 \times 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-2}$). In order to avoid contamination by Galactic point sources and those in neighboring galaxies, we exclude regions at Galactic latitudes $|b| \leq 15^\circ$ and circular regions of radius $5^\circ 5$ and $3^\circ 0$ around the Large and Small Magellanic Clouds, respectively (Fig. 4, blue line). We also, due to the large uncertainties, exclude all sources fainter than $F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} \sim 6 \times 10^{-14} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, such that 4785 objects are included for the log N -log S calculation, including 1804 blazars (519 *BLLs*, 682 *FSRQs*, and 575 *BCUs*), and 2981 blazar candidates.

The log N -log S distributions are shown in Fig. 14. The faded color and dashed lines show the distributions without using the correction obtained from the simulation. These uncorrected distributions stress how important it is to take the *eROSITA* survey sensitivity into account. There is a slight deviation, or “dip”, in the distribution at fluxes around $F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} \approx 1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Tests with different selection criteria, such as restricting the sources to the common footprint of the BLAZE catalog input catalogs, do not remove this feature. Based on the simulation presented in Sect. 3.3, however, we can exclude it to be due to *eROSITA*’s sensitivity, as the feature is not present in the simulated data, which uses the as-flown *eROSITA* attitude. Computing log N -log S distributions for various ecliptic latitude bins for the eRASS1 catalog results in noisier distributions in this particular flux range, which is characterized by a small number of objects. The deviation from a smooth function becomes more pronounced, and we therefore conclude that this feature is most likely due to small number statistics, possibly in combination with source inhomogeneities in the sky, as also documented by Merloni et al. (2024; Sect. 5.5).

tion, or “dip”, in the distribution at fluxes around $F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} \approx 1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Tests with different selection criteria, such as restricting the sources to the common footprint of the BLAZE catalog input catalogs, do not remove this feature. Based on the simulation presented in Sect. 3.3, however, we can exclude it to be due to *eROSITA*’s sensitivity, as the feature is not present in the simulated data, which uses the as-flown *eROSITA* attitude. Computing log N -log S distributions for various ecliptic latitude bins for the eRASS1 catalog results in noisier distributions in this particular flux range, which is characterized by a small number of objects. The deviation from a smooth function becomes more pronounced, and we therefore conclude that this feature is most likely due to small number statistics, possibly in combination with source inhomogeneities in the sky, as also documented by Merloni et al. (2024; Sect. 5.5).




Fig. 14. $\log N$ - $\log S$ distributions for sources within the extragalactic sky. Panel **a**: comparison of the total sample of *eROSITA* observed blazars and blazar candidates (black) with the distribution by Giommi & Padovani (2015; purple). Green and brown show the $\log N$ - $\log S$ for both classes separately (green: *eROSITA* observed blazars, brown: observed candidates). Panel **b**: comparison of the predictions of Giommi & Padovani (2015) for *BLLs* (light blue) and *FSRQs* (light red) with *eROSITA* measurements for *BLLs*, *FSRQs*, and *BCUs*, using the color code of Fig. 3).

In order to compare our results to the only available predictions for the X-ray band for the $\log N$ - $\log S$ of blazars (Giommi & Padovani 2015), we convert all fluxes to the 0.3–3.5 keV band. Our $\log N$ - $\log S$ distributions agree quite well with theoretical expectations and agree in terms of the slope. Giommi & Padovani (2015) did not assume the blazar sequence but the blazar-simplified view, which provides a reasonable explanation for the observed $\log N$ - $\log S$ distribution. However, no definitive statement about whether the blazar sequence or the blazar-simplified view is true can be made, as the overall results are consistent with both scenarios. A detailed investigation is beyond the scope of this paper. Assuming that the blazar candidates are indeed predominantly blazars, the incompleteness of the BlazEr1 catalog at high fluxes is low with respect to the prediction by Giommi et al. (2019). At the highest fluxes the prediction is lower than the observed $\log N$ - $\log S$ distribution. This discrepancy is caused by the 20 brightest blazars, which are predominantly *BLLs*. After cross-checking the fluxes with the unpublished eRASS2 data, we can rule out flaring as the cause of this feature. Fluxes this high are not covered by Giommi & Padovani (2015). Since the number of sources in this flux regime is negligible the discrepancy at high fluxes is due to small number statistics and thus not relevant to the overall result.

We find that confirmed blazars dominate the source numbers in the high-flux regime, with a similar trend as in the combined $\log N$ - $\log S$ distribution, with incompleteness inducing a deviation from the prediction at fluxes below $2 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. At low fluxes, the blazar candidates dominate. Likely most or all blazars with high fluxes have already been identified, unlike those at low fluxes, which are therefore included in the candidate catalogs used to build the BLAZE catalog. We can also compare the distributions of the subtypes of confirmed blazars and find that incompleteness effects are seen at lower fluxes, with respect to the predictions by Giommi & Padovani (2015). At high fluxes the *BLLs* agree quite well with their prediction. For *FSRQs* the $\log N$ - $\log S$ is found below the theoretical curve but the slopes are consistent. For the *BCUs*, the $\log N$ - $\log S$ distribution for most part lies above that of *FSRQs*. All these sources either belong to the *BLL* or *FSRQ* type but have not been identified yet, explaining parts of the observed incompleteness (the majority of *BCUs* are thought be *BLLs*; Kang et al. 2019; Peña-Herazo et al. 2020; Chiaro et al. 2021). Giommi & Padovani (2015) also predict a population inversion between *BLLs* and *FSRQs* at a flux of $F_{X,0.3-3.5 \text{ keV}} \approx 1 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, resulting from the dif-

ferent slopes, which is related to the evolution and distribution of the source classes in the Universe. Such an inversion is seen in the data as well, although at a slightly higher flux, albeit this discrepancy could be due to the incompleteness of our data and other causes can not be ruled out as well.

An earlier comparison by Turriziani et al. (2019) of data with the Giommi & Padovani (2015) predictions shows a similar shape in $\log N$ - $\log S$, although due to incompleteness their $\log N$ - $\log S$ distribution lies below the prediction. Candidates included by Turriziani et al. (2019) resulted in distributions above the $\log N$ - $\log S$ expectation, therefore indicating that the candidates included might be contaminated by other sources. This observation is not reproduced here, indicating that the candidates in the BLAZE catalog are predominantly blazars with low contamination from other source classes.

The slopes of $\log N$ - $\log S$ distributions have implications for the cosmological evolution of blazars (e.g., Maccacaro et al. 1987; Langejahn et al. 2020; Marcotulli et al. 2022). A slope of $\alpha = 1.5$ implies no cosmological evolution, that is, the sources are uniformly distributed in the Universe. Less steep slopes indicate a negative cosmological evolution, where sources are more common in the local Universe and their density declines with increasing redshift. On the other hand steeper slopes correspond to a positive evolution and more or brighter sources at higher redshifts than in the local Universe. We determine slopes for all the observed distributions, taking flux uncertainties into account by using a Monte-Carlo approach and assuming that fluxes follow a normal distribution. We fit a power law in the form of

$$N = C \times \left(\frac{F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}}}{10^{-15} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}} \right)^{-\alpha} \quad (7)$$

to the 0.2–2.3 keV $\log N$ - $\log S$ distribution⁹, limiting ourselves to fluxes $F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} \geq 3 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ to avoid incompleteness effects. The resulting parameters are listed in Table 5 and the best-fit functions are shown in Fig. A.3. The normalization for the best fit to the *BLLs* is too low compared to the observed distribution, an effect due to the flattening caused by incompleteness, beaming effects (Marcotulli et al. 2022), and the low number of sources at high fluxes; however, the slope matches well. All measured slopes are below or close to 1.5, therefore we find almost all subtypes and the overall *eROSITA* observed blazars to be consistent with negative cosmological

⁹ The conversion between flux bands does not impact the slope.

Table 5. Results of power law fits (Eq. 7) to the log N -log S distributions of different samples, measured for fluxes above 3×10^{-13} erg cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$, where incompleteness effects do not distort the distribution.

Parameter	All	Blazars	Blazar candidates	<i>BLL</i>	<i>FSRQ</i>	<i>BCU</i>
C [deg $^{-2}$]	54.6 ± 2.0	22.5 ± 0.9	234.4 ± 27.2	3.66 ± 0.23	57.5 ± 6.8	26.9 ± 3.0
α	1.095 ± 0.005	1.002 ± 0.005	1.537 ± 0.017	0.825 ± 0.008	1.387 ± 0.017	1.232 ± 0.015

evolution. For the blazar candidates the slope is close to no evolution at all or a slightly positive one. As the log N -log S distribution possible shows breaks, we also considered a broken power law as a fit function for the entire sample using the same fit approach. One possible break is found at $F_{X,\text{break}, 0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} = (2.11 \pm 0.26) \times 10^{-12}$ erg cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$, although a second less significant solutions exists with the break at a slightly smaller flux value. The position of the break could coincide with the flux region in which *FSRQs* start to be detected but is also close to the previously described dip and could therefore be a survey effect not related to blazars at all. Specific modeling of the log N -log S and an analysis of the cosmological evolution of blazars, which would require a very detailed study of the luminosity function and modeling it with different evolutionary scenarios, is beyond the scope of this paper.

Older studies were based on comparably few sources, reducing the significance of some conclusions. Previous work has indicated a positive evolution for *FSRQs* (Wolter & Celotti 2001; Toda et al. 2017; Turriziani et al. 2019; Marcotulli et al. 2022). For *BLLs*, different trends have been observed, depending on the underlying source sample. Slightly positive to no evolution has been found for *BLLs* of the LSP type (Stickel et al. 1991). HSPs have been found to be consistent with negative evolution (Rector et al. 2000). In hard X-ray selected samples, *FSRQs* are found to evolve positively, whereas *BLLs* show no or negative evolution (Ajello et al. 2009; Toda et al. 2017; Marcotulli et al. 2022). For γ -ray selected samples *BLLs* also follow a positive evolution, with the exception of HSPs, which show a negative evolution (Ajello et al. 2014). However, the slope reported by Langejahn et al. (2020) for a radio selected *Swift*-BAT sample is close to the one reported in our work, indicating a negative evolution as well. The hard X-ray log N -log S by Langejahn et al. (2020) shows a significant difference in slope than their radio input sample. Langejahn et al. attribute this to different evolution of the X-ray and radio emission, with the former having a peak at $z \sim 1.5$. Our results using *eROSITA* support this conclusion, as the soft X-rays seen by *eROSITA* exhibit similar properties as the hard X-ray sources studied by Langejahn et al. (2020), although the evolution found by them is different than in other studies (e.g., Toda et al. 2017; Marcotulli et al. 2022).

The number of blazars *eROSITA* was supposed to detect has been predicted in the literature assuming that soft and hard X-ray log N -log S -distributions are similar. Toda et al. (2017) predicted *eROSITA* to observe 13900 *FSRQs* and 1900 *BLLs* on the entire sky within four years. We indeed detect slightly more *FSRQs* than *BLLs*, at low fluxes more *FSRQs* are observed by roughly an order of magnitude. The prediction would require the vast majority of unclassified sources to be *FSRQs*, which would be inconsistent with the expectation that *BCUs* are more likely *BLLs*. Considering that the actual *eROSITA* survey is less sensitive than assumed, the numbers at least somewhat agree as a rough order-of-magnitude estimate.

Marcotulli et al. (2022) predicted that in its first year *eROSITA* should observe 230023 *FSRQs* with fluxes $F_{X, 0.2-2.0 \text{ keV}} \geq 1 \times 10^{-14}$ erg cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$ across the entire sky and across a wide range of redshifts. The BlazEr1 catalog contains

not even 1% of this predicted number. Considering the best fit to the log N -log S distribution for the *FSRQ* sample, ~ 2.17 deg $^{-2}$ are expected to be observed, corresponding to 89654 *FSRQs* over the entire sky, which only corresponds to 39% of the predicted number. The discrepancy is in part caused by Marcotulli et al. (2022) assuming a different, deeper, limiting flux level. Additionally, the assumed slopes of the log N -log S distribution are different and both estimates assume that the slope at higher fluxes is the same at low fluxes, which might not be the case.

5.6. Past X-ray observations and properties of *eROSITA* detected blazars

In this section, we compare our *eROSITA* results with those from other missions, for sources which are detected in both. Since earlier work estimated fluxes assuming power law slopes with $\Gamma_X = 1.7$ or similar (OUSXB: $\Gamma_X = 1.8$), when comparing results in this subsection we will consistently use *eROSITA*-fluxes obtained assuming $\Gamma_X = 1.7$, even for those where we or the other works were able to constrain the spectral shape.

ROSAT, as the precursor of *eROSITA*, sets the benchmark for all-sky surveys at soft X-ray energies. Due to the different spatial accuracies we matched the *eROSITA* detected sources with a quite large radius $\leq 40''$, hence this comparison is more prone to potential mismatches. In total we obtain 1496 matches between *eROSITA* and *ROSAT* and in total 1865 *ROSAT* sources coinciding with BLAZE catalog objects on the western Galactic hemisphere within $40''$. Of the *ROSAT* BLAZE catalog matches, 108 are included in the *unverified* BlazEr1 catalog, while 261 sources detected by *ROSAT* are not detected by *eROSITA*. Therefore *eROSITA* is able to recover 84% of the blazars and blazar candidates detected by *ROSAT*. Since *eROSITA* is sensitive over the entire sky down to a similar flux limit as *ROSAT* ($F_{X, 0.1-2.4 \text{ keV}} = 10^{-13}$ erg cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$, Boller et al. 2016), the sources not included in the BlazEr1 catalogs are probably missing due to variability. The fluxes measured by *ROSAT* agree with the *eROSITA* fluxes within the *eROSITA* uncertainties in only 9.5% of the matches. Variability is present and the majority of sources are within the same order of magnitude. There are 543 objects with *ROSAT* fluxes higher by more than an order of magnitude, whereas for the reverse, only five cases are observed. This subsample of high-flux *ROSAT* matches does not grow or shrink in number with different angular separations between the source positions of the two missions. A similar trend with respect to *XMM-Newton* is reported by Boller et al. (2016; their Fig. 25), probably caused by spurious *ROSAT* detections combined with systematic differences between the instruments, such as energy coverage and sensitivity. The *ROSAT* photon indices are not well constrained, have large uncertainties and do not correlate with the *eROSITA* ones. This is likely due to the different signal-to-noise levels and the restricted energy coverage of *ROSAT*.

For sources both in the *eROSITA* and the *Swift*-XRT catalog (Evans et al. 2020), we confidently detect 1249 of the 1700 matches within the eRASS1 footprint between Evans et al. (2020) and the BLAZE catalog, assuming a maximum separation of $8''$. 451 sources are not part of the BlazEr1 catalog and

eROSITA picks up 73% of the *Swift*-XRT detected blazars and blazar candidates. The fluxes are broadly consistent, although only 25% of the matches agree with each other within the uncertainties. However, many sources tend to have higher fluxes in *Swift*-XRT than in *eROSITA*: for 57% of the sources the flux in *eROSITA* is at least 30% less than in *Swift*-XRT. This higher flux is caused partly by variability, but also due to the fact that the approach of [Evans et al. \(2020\)](#) uses all available data for a given source position, such that these flux values represent the combination of different flux states of a source, with a bias towards brighter states. Many *Swift*-XRT observations are triggered following flaring states, explaining a bias towards brighter states. Sensitivity differences between the instruments might also play a role. The photon indices mostly agree with each other, with a slight trend towards somewhat softer photon indices measured with *eROSITA* ($\Delta\Gamma_X \sim 0.05$).

A similar picture presents itself when comparing our catalog to the OUSXB ([Giommi et al. 2019](#)). Similar to [Evans et al. \(2020\)](#), this catalog uses all *Swift*-XRT observations, however, the catalog offers data for each individual observation. In terms of total numbers, OUSXB DR3 contains 1223 BLAZE catalog sources in the western Galactic hemisphere ([Giommi et al. 2019](#); 2508 BLAZE catalog sources are listed for the entire sky), of which 1039 are confidently detected and an additional 85 objects are part of the *unverified* catalog. This means that only 99 sources go completely undetected by *eROSITA*.

The BlazEr1 catalog lists 2106 confirmed blazars, therefore it is the largest collection of X-ray detected blazars on the western Galactic sky by a factor of 1.7. Taking the blazar candidates into account, the BlazEr1 catalog encompasses the largest sample of X-ray detected blazars and blazar-candidates to this day. In Fig. 15 we compare the mean flux value of [Giommi et al. \(2019\)](#) with our flux. Generally, the fluxes are consistent with each other within the *eROSITA* uncertainties and the maximum and minimum value provided by [Giommi et al. \(2019\)](#). In ~48% of sources, we observe flux variations due to source variability. However, due to a slightly different photon index being used and due to the observational biases by *Swift*-XRT in terms of including all data and therefore also including flares, for more than 50% of the sources the fluxes do not agree. The same has already been observed when comparing to the catalog by [Evans et al. \(2020\)](#). Generally, the photon indices are consistent with each other with ~68% of the values agreeing within the uncertainties of *eROSITA* and the maximum and minimum values given in the OUSXB (Fig. 16). Overall, there seems to be a slight trend of deriving softer photon indices using *eROSITA* compared to *Swift*-XRT (mean $\Delta\Gamma_X \sim 0.08$, with 17% of the sources having a diverging photon index of at least 1σ deviation). This may be explained by the harder-when-brighter trend in connection with the bias of *Swift*-XRT observations towards flaring states. Overall, the results derived from *eROSITA* data are consistent with previous studies.

For the hard X-rays we compare our soft X-ray fluxes with the hard X-ray fluxes obtained by *Swift*-BAT ([Lien et al. 2025](#)) and *NuSTAR* ([Middei et al. 2022](#)). Very few sources are identified in the *Swift*-BAT data. The *Swift*-BAT fluxes are all in a similar range and we test how these hard X-ray fluxes correlate with the *eROSITA* flux. *Swift*-BAT picks up more *FSRQs* and *BCUs*, and they tend to have slightly higher fluxes in *Swift*-BAT compared to *BLLs*, for which all correlations are insignificant. For the softer *NuSTAR* band higher fluxes in *eROSITA* correspond to higher fluxes in *NuSTAR*. In the harder band, the trends are quite similar but appear with weaker significance. The photon indices of *NuSTAR* and *Swift*-BAT are similar to those observed




Fig. 15. *Swift*-XRT flux reported by [Giommi et al. \(2019\)](#) as a function of *eROSITA* flux, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3. The mean values of all measurements for a source listed in [Giommi et al. \(2019\)](#) are shown. The uncertainties of the *Swift*-XRT fluxes represent the minimum and maximum values provided by [Giommi et al. \(2019\)](#). The solid line represents the unity line, while the dashed ones indicate a factor 10 difference between the measurements.




Fig. 16. Mean photon indices derived by *Swift*-XRT using [Giommi et al. \(2019\)](#) and *eROSITA*, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3. The uncertainties of the *Swift*-XRT photon indices represent the minimum and maximum values provided by [Giommi et al. \(2019\)](#). The solid line represents unity. Differences are observed, indicating that blazars are variable in their spectral properties.

by *eROSITA*, establishing a linear correlation between indices in the soft and hard X-ray band.

Finally, we stress that many of the BlazEr1 sources were never observed with other X-ray missions. It contains 5569 and 5649 sources that have never been observed by *XMM-Newton* and *Chandra*, respectively. Other missions show similar high numbers of unobserved sources (*ASCA*: 5808, *NuSTAR*: 5761, *Suzaku*: 5822, *Swift*-XRT: 3909 and *ROSAT*: 5623). We find that 3668 BlazEr1 sources (63% of the BlazEr1 catalog) have no prior X-ray observations with any of the listed missions. Considering only confirmed blazars, 38% of these were never observed with any pointed X-ray instrument. The sample of previously unobserved blazars is dominated by *FSRQs* and *BCUs*. Since *BLLs*

are more easily detected due to their higher X-ray fluxes, they might be targeted more often, such that previous missions will have more exposure time at positions associated with *BLLs*. Due to the large amount of new X-ray data, *eROSITA* enables us to study a more complete picture of the blazar population.

5.7. Multiwavelength properties of the BlazEr1 sources

In this section, we combine *eROSITA* data with multiwavelength data available for BlazEr1 sources (see Sect. 4). We discuss the γ -ray, radio, infrared, and optical properties and how the properties in the different wavelength regimes are connected with the X-rays.

5.7.1. The γ -ray emission of BlazEr1 sources

In Figure 17 we compare the X-ray and γ -ray fluxes of the BlazEr1 sources. We fit a linear function in log-space ($\log_{10}(F_{\gamma,0.2-100\text{ GeV}}) = m \times \log_{10}(F_{X,0.2-2.3\text{ keV}}) + t$) to the distributions, and calculate correlation coefficients. For *FSRQs*, a dense cloud indicating a direct correlation of X-ray and γ -ray fluxes can be seen, although the correlation is weak. The distributions of *BLLs* and *BCUs* are more spread out and most likely not correlated. Since almost all *FSRQs* belong to the class of LSPs, a correlation between X-ray and γ -ray emission is somewhat expected as the emission is expected to be produced by the same emission mechanism. For *BLLs* and *BCUs*, which consist of a mix of LSPs, ISPs, and HSPs, a correlation is less straightforward, but from $F_{X,0.2-2.3\text{ keV}} \sim 2 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ on, sources with higher X-ray fluxes also seem to have higher γ -ray fluxes. Additionally, we observe that in general, sources with a γ -ray detection have higher X-ray fluxes than the non- γ -ray detected ones, which has also been previously reported by Paliya et al. (2017).

In Fig. 18 we compare the *Fermi*-LAT photon indices to the *eROSITA* photon indices. There is a clear separation between *BLLs* and *FSRQs*. On average, the X-ray index of *BLLs* is softer than the γ -ray index, while for *FSRQs* the opposite is observed. This is partly due to the different SED types these classes are mainly associated with. However, roughly 4% of the *BLLs* are occupying the same region as the *FSRQs*, which are mostly classified as LSPs. The *BCUs* are distributed among the different groups. Previous studies (e.g., Comastri et al. 1997; Fan et al. 2012; Yuan & Fan 2014) have found that the X-ray and γ -ray photon indices of the entire blazar population are anti-correlated. This trend is seen for the overall sample as well (see Fig. 18), however, not as strongly and there also seem to be differences for the subgroups. For the entire sample we find a best fit with a linear fit function ($\Gamma_{\gamma} = m \times \Gamma_X + t$) with fit values between the ones reported by Fan et al. (2012) and Yuan & Fan (2014). We emphasize that the correlation is relatively weak but significant. The subgroups show no correlation, with the exception of a very weak anticorrelation for *BCUs*.

We note that the data compared here have not been taken simultaneously, and we compare X-ray fluxes taken at a specific time (during eRASS1) with γ -ray fluxes from the 4FGL-DR4 averaged over 14 years. Hence, variability can make the interpretation difficult.

5.7.2. Radio emission of BlazEr1 sources

In Fig. 19 we show the flux densities obtained from TANAMI, MOJAVE, and RFC as a function of *eROSITA* flux. Of the 52




Fig. 17. *Fermi*-LAT fluxes (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) compared with *eROSITA* fluxes. The three panels show the different subtypes, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3 (a: *FSRQs*, b: *BLLs*, c: *BCUs*). The *Fermi*-LAT uncertainties are scaled to match the confidence limit of the *eROSITA* data.

TANAMI matches, the majority belongs to the *FSRQ* class, as this program targets γ -ray detected sources up to a limiting radio flux density, as well as highly variable jetted non-blazar AGN. Flux densities in TANAMI mostly increase as a function of *eROSITA* flux and we find a strong correlation for *FSRQs*. Almost twice as many objects are matched with MOJAVE (97); the overall trends are similar to TANAMI and a correlation with the *eROSITA* flux is found as well. The RFC contains radio flux densities for 2620 BlazEr1 sources. Again a similar trend of the flux densities being correlated as in TANAMI and MOJAVE is observed for *FSRQs*. Based on the RFC data, we find that for *BLLs* flux densities in the radio are similar, regardless of the X-ray flux and no strong correlation is found. This behavior is also observed for the *BLLs* in TANAMI and MOJAVE, although the number of individual objects is very low compared to the RFC and the correlations found are




Fig. 18. *Fermi*-LAT photon index (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) compared with the *eROSITA* photon index, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3 (*BLLs*: blue, *FSRQs*: red, *BCUs*: orange). In solid, the linear best fit is shown, additionally the correlation between the two parameters found by Yuan & Fan (2014; dashed) and Fan et al. (2012; dotted) are displayed. The uncertainties of Γ_γ are extrapolated to the 90% confidence interval.

not statistically significant. Again, the different physical origin of the emission is likely driving the diverging behavior between the *FSRQs* and *BLLs*.

5.7.3. Infrared and optical properties of *eROSITA* detected blazars

Infrared colors are commonly used to characterize different types of AGN (e.g., Salvato et al. 2018; their Fig. 9). In the infrared color-color diagram (Fig. 20) blazars occupy a distinct region due to the non-thermal emission of the jet, which enables good distinction from thermal emitters (Massaro et al. 2011; D’Abrusco et al. 2012; Massaro et al. 2012; Salvato et al. 2018; de Menezes et al. 2019). Most of the sources in BlazEr1 are contained within the WISE blazar strip, consistent with non-thermal emission and an extragalactic origin. This strip also covers the region usually occupied by QSOs and Seyfert galaxies, and extends towards spiral and elliptical galaxies. Objects located far from this region are mostly blazar candidates of some kind, although sources associated with confirmed blazars are found in other parts of the color-color diagram as well. A high number of *BCUCs* are found in the regions associated with starburst, spiral, and elliptical galaxies, as well as stars. The infrared colors also separate the *BLLs* and *FSRQs* as they are found in different regions. *BLLs* tend to have bluer colors than the *FSRQs*. *BCUs* are found in similar loci as *BLLs* and *FSRQs*.

We can also combine the infrared data with optical and X-ray information. In Fig. 21 we show four different photometric spaces, which can be used to distinguish between Galactic and extragalactic sources and see if objects exhibit similar properties as other AGN (Salvato et al. 2022). The $(g-r)-(z-W1)$ color-color diagram is shown in Fig. 21a. Most BlazEr1 sources are above the dotted line and thus consistent with being extragalactic. There are many candidates, as well as a small number of confirmed sources below this line, hinting at a low level of contamination (see Sect. 3.2).




Fig. 19. Correlation of radio flux densities and *eROSITA* fluxes, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3, using **a** data from the TANAMI program, **b** data from MOJAVE, and **c** X-band flux densities from the RFC catalog.

A sequence parallel to the separation line can be identified as well, mainly consisting of candidates, *BCUs*, and *BZGs*, which is typically the location of quiescent galaxies. Salvato et al. (2022) show a similar trend with redshift, where sources at low redshifts are more red. This trend is also observed in our sample, since *FSRQs* are typically found at higher redshifts and are also located at bluer colors. In Fig. 21b we show the *W1* magnitude as a function of X-ray flux. This information can be used to check the extragalactic content, although the separation line shown becomes a less robust indicator as the X-ray survey increases in size (Salvato et al. 2022). While most sources are consistent with an extragalactic origin, the objects below this line are *BCUCs*, again indicating that the catalog is subject to some degree of contamination. The optical-infrared color-color diagram (Fig. 21c), which can be used to distinguish stars from AGN, does not ex-




Fig. 20. WISE color-color diagram, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3. Regions populated by different types of AGN, as well as other objects, are shown. Compare our results to Salvato et al. (2018; Fig. 9), for a color-color diagrams of the 2RXS and XMMSL2 samples.

hibit a sequence of most likely Galactic sources as seen in Salvato et al. (2022), maybe due to the incompleteness of *Gaia*. The tail at high values of $g-W1$ corresponding to inactive galaxies is less pronounced and mainly occupied by candidates (*BCUCs* and *BLLCs*). The WISE color-magnitude diagram (Fig. 21d) can be used to identify stars (typically $W1-W2 \sim 0.0$, marked with a dashed line) and quasars. Most objects are quasar-like.

The BlazEr1 sources are located where we expect to observe AGNs and only very few are located elsewhere and are inconsistent with an extragalactic nature. Overall, sources are similar to QSOs (solid gray line) and extend towards the loci of Seyferts (dotted gray line), where we also find a high number of candidates. The infrared and optical data show that the catalog might have some degree of contamination by other source types, although a detailed source-by-source analysis would be required to see if sources with data typical for non-blazars are in fact contaminants.

5.7.4. Broadband spectral indices of the *eROSITA* blazars

As detailed in Sect. 4.5, in order to relate the X-rays to other bands we computed broadband spectral indices, α_{ij} , for different bands from the radio to the γ rays. For a given SED, the observed spectral index will depend on the peak frequencies and the luminosities of the SED peaks. A value $\alpha > 1.0$ indicates a negative slope in νF_ν space, meaning the SED decreases towards higher energies. We display the broadband spectral indices as calculated from various bands against each other in Fig. 22. For objects that are also in the 4LAC, in Fig. A.4, we show the indices as a function of Compton dominance, the ratio of the peak fluxes, and low- and high-energy SED peak frequencies (Ajello et al. 2020, 2022). Additionally, we calculate correlation coefficients for different parameter combinations in order to assess the correlations between parameters for the entire sample and the *BLL*

and *FSRQ* sub samples. The results are listed in Tables B.2 and B.3 and mean values obtained for the broadband spectral indices are shown in Table B.4.

FSRQs mostly show values of $\alpha_{XT} \sim 1.0$, that is they show no significant increase or decrease from the X-rays towards the γ rays, which is expected, since X-rays are more likely to cover the rise of the high-energy peak and the γ rays cover the fall of the same peak. The values of α_{XT} do not correlate significantly with the peak positions but there is a significant weak anticorrelation with Compton dominance (see Fig. A.4i and Table B.2). As indicated by the values of α_{OX} , a decreasing slope from the optical towards the X-rays is observed for a majority of *FSRQs*, and no correlation with the SED parameters is found. Similar results are found for α_{IRX} , however, the slopes are slightly steeper and the dispersion is smaller (see Table B.4), perhaps due to *FSRQs* displaying a big blue bump which adds flux in the infrared-UV range (Krauß et al. 2016). A very weak correlation between the infrared X-ray spectral index α_{IRX} and the low-energy peak position is present. Only extreme cases of *FSRQs* with low-energy peaks in the radio range are found to decrease from the radio towards the X-rays, however, the vast majority of sources show an increase. We find a very weak anticorrelation between α_{RX} and the low-energy peak position.

For *BLLs* both rising and falling indices from the X-rays to the γ rays are observed, but the mean value indicates a flat index. Sources with decreasing slopes have their high-energy peak at energies below GeV γ rays, where *Fermi*-LAT is sensitive, and show low Compton dominance. Larger values of α_{XT} are linked to higher peak frequencies, as this parameter is moderately and weakly correlated with the low- and high-energy peak frequencies, respectively, and a lower Compton dominance, with a weak anticorrelation being present. The values of α_{OX} indicate that for *BLLs*, on average a decreasing slope from the optical towards the X-rays is observed. However, some sources exhibit an increase that corresponds to extreme HSPs. In general, a higher spread of values is seen than for *FSRQs*. In most cases the low-energy peak occurs at energies lower than the X-ray band and an increase in the value of α_{OX} corresponds to a lower peak frequency for the low-energy peak, but this anticorrelation is very weak. An anticorrelation with the peak frequency of the high-energy peak is observed, however, we find no correlation with Compton dominance.

We observe a very similar picture for the infrared range. *BLLs* are found at more extreme decreasing and increasing slopes towards the X-ray band than the *FSRQs* as indicated by the larger spread. We observe only a weak anticorrelation with the position of the low-energy peak and a moderate one with the high-energy peak. *BLLs* show a stronger increase from the radio band towards the X-rays than *FSRQs* and a higher dispersion. We see a moderate anticorrelation with the SED peak positions. Since in many *BLLs* the radio and X-ray emission are thought to originate from the same process, a trend between peak positions and α -values is expected, as lower values in α correspond to peak positions at higher energies. Candidates and confirmed blazars show similar behavior without significant offsets. The *BCUs* are consistent with being blazars of either type.

For α_{XT} we find a significantly strong or moderate anticorrelation with all other indices, however, the correlation is different for *FSRQs* and *BLLs*, as for the *BLLs* the anticorrelations are stronger. There is a weaker anticorrelation between α_{XT} for *FSRQs* and the other ranges, consistent with the X-rays covering the dip of the low-energy peak or the rise of the high-energy peak in the SED. For *BLLs* the anticorrelation is stronger, and for lower α_{XT} values, these *BLLs* have higher Compton dominance




Fig. 21. Different photometric spaces combining optical, infrared and X-ray data, similar to Salvato et al. (2022; ; Fig. 18) for point sources detected in eFEDS, using the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3. Solid gray lines show positions usually occupied by quasars, whereas the gray dotted lines corresponded to Seyfert 2 galaxies. The dashed black lines in the upper panels distinguish between Galactic and extragalactic sources.

and lower peak frequencies (LSP). The α_{OX} and α_{IRX} indices have higher values compared to $\alpha_{\text{X}\Gamma}$, which is the opposite of α_{RX} . For the *BLLs* a strong correlation is found with the α_{RX} and the infrared and optical. For the *FSRQs* we find no or only very weak correlations. This is expected, as in many *BLLs* these bands share the same emission process origin, showing strong correlations, whereas for *FSRQs* the X-rays originate from the high-energy peak but the other bands are related to the low-energy peak. The correlation between α_{OX} and α_{IRX} is a strong or moderate one, with α_{OX} having slightly higher values. The

weaker correlation for *FSRQs* is probably due to the big blue bump (Krauß et al. 2016; and references therein).

The values derived for α_{OX} are similar to those found in the literature (see, e.g., Giommi et al. 1999; Turriziani et al. 2007). Broadband spectral indices for the γ rays and X-rays have also been provided for example by Comastri et al. (1997) using *EGRET*, however, their values (*FSRQs*: $\alpha_{\text{X}\Gamma} = 0.58 \pm 0.12$, *BLLs*: $\alpha_{\text{X}\Gamma} = 0.83 \pm 0.18$) are lower than ours, probably due to the lower energy band covered in the γ rays.

No significant strong or moderate correlations can be found between the photon indices and values of α , however, the sub-




Fig. 22. Broadband spectral indices α_{XF} , α_{IRX} , and α_{RX} against each other, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3. Due to the similar values obtained for α_{OX} and α_{IRX} , the former is not shown here.

classes show different trends. We found only weak correlations for *BLLs* with α_{IRX} and α_{OX} and a weak anticorrelation with α_{XF} . Anticorrelations from some samples with α_{RX} are observed. Moderate correlations between the α -value and redshift are observed. The α_{XF} decreases with redshift, while α_{RX} increases.

Since values of α correlate with the SED peaks and Compton dominance, selection cuts could be applied to identify sources with different SED types or certain peak positions. In particular, α_{IRX} , α_{OX} , and α_{RX} could be useful to classify the sources into HSP ($\alpha_{RX} < 0.69$, $\alpha_{IRX} < 1.12$) and LSP ($\alpha_{RX} > 0.87$, $1.5 > \alpha_{IRX} > 1.0$) categories. For ISP it is not possible to find boundaries that separate them from the other SED types well. For the HSP constraints, 69% of classifications agree with the SED definition when compared to the 4LAC catalog; for LSPs more than 96% are recovered. The BlazEr1 catalog contains 127 blazars within the HSP constraints outlined, these could potentially be TeV blazars (see Metzger et al. 2025), and 812 sources within the proposed LSP criteria. Sources with values close to $\alpha_{IRX} \sim 1.2$, $\alpha_{OX} \sim 1.2$, and $\alpha_{RX} \sim 1.0$ could be MeV blazars, and are interesting targets for future MeV missions (e.g., COSI; Tomsick et al. 2019, 2024).

5.8. Why are some sources not detected?

We now consider objects which have not been detected by *eROSITA*, or only at low significance. In Table 6 we list the number of detected sources from each input catalog, also distinguishing among the different classes, with respect to the western Galactic hemisphere, and considering the quality cuts to the BLAZE catalog. Overall, only $\sim 14\%$ of all BLAZE catalog sources are part of the BlazEr1 catalog, however, $\sim 69\%$ of the gold sample (confirmed blazars in the BLAZE catalog) is detected. Due to *eROSITA*'s all-sky survey strategy and higher sensitivity we miss less than one third of the confirm blazar pop-




Fig. 23. X-ray luminosity as a function of redshift, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3. BlazEr1 sources are shown in gray. The colored symbols are sources with low DET_LIKE, quality issues or a high angular separation. The added lines are the same as in Fig. 9. The upper limits have been taken from the BLAZE catalog.

ulation, a significant improvement to *Swift*-XRT (43%, Giommi et al. 2019).

The BZCAT, 4FGL, and 3HSP catalogs exhibit the highest detection fraction among all input catalogs, as they contain the most extensive list of confirmed blazars. The fact that the 4FGL has such a high detection rate implies that γ rays are a good indicator for a subsequent X-ray detection, which is connected to the fact that the γ -ray detected sources have brighter X-ray fluxes. The HighZ objects are less likely to be detected, probably due to their faintness given their high redshifts. The candidates also have a lower detection rate, which is due to contamination and these sources generally being fainter. The Milliquas catalog, which mainly adds candidates to the BLAZE catalog, has a high-detection rate as well, due to also containing many confirmed blazars. Other candidate catalogs exhibit detection rates between 8% and 58%. The BROS catalog has the lowest detection rate, despite having the highest number of input sources. A large contributing factor is the increased level of contamination compared to other catalogs.

Among the confirmed blazars, *BLLs* and *FSRQs* have slightly higher detection rates than *BCUs*, of which only more than half are detected. This could mean that *BCUs* also contain more contaminating objects, and that their X-ray fluxes are too low to be detected. The different candidate classes have lower detection rates. *eROSITA* is more likely to detect *FSRQs* than other candidate classes.

As a next step we use the *eROSITA* sensitivity (see Sect. 3.3) to obtain flux and luminosity upper limits for the undetected blazars and blazar candidates. The majority of non-detected sources have upper limits below the flux at which the all-sky survey is complete (Fig. 4). The upper limits agree with those of Tubín-Arenas et al. (2024). Since Tubín-Arenas et al. (2024) also considered the counts actually observed by *eROSITA*, their upper limits are sometimes higher than ours. As a next step, we calculate luminosity upper limits for sources with known redshifts (Fig. 23). The exposure times, fluxes and luminosity limits are all listed in the BLAZE catalog. At low redshifts, *BCUs* in particular are abundant. We also observe *FSRQs* at higher redshifts than *BLLs* as previously seen in Sect. 5.2. The dashed-dotted line in Fig. 23, which corresponds to a flux of

Table 6. Completeness of the BlazEr1 catalog. The detection fractions of different catalogs are listed according to the class. The column All lists all sources regardless of class and each class has its own column. Note that the column All lists the fraction with respect to all sources within the respective input catalog used to compile the BLAZE catalog regardless if they are listed in the BLAZE catalog, whereas the class columns only consider sources which were taken from the respective catalogs and added to the BLAZE catalog. Only objects on the western Galactic hemisphere are considered.

Catalog	All		<i>BLL</i>		<i>BLLC</i>		<i>BZG</i>		<i>FSRQ</i>		<i>FSRQC</i>		<i>BCU</i>		<i>BCUC</i>	
		[%]		[%]		[%]		[%]		[%]		[%]		[%]		[%]
BLAZE	$\left(\frac{5865}{41936}\right)$	14.0	$\left(\frac{597}{802}\right)$	74.4	$\left(\frac{954}{3188}\right)$	29.9	$\left(\frac{28}{59}\right)$	47.5	$\left(\frac{769}{929}\right)$	82.8	$\left(\frac{913}{1799}\right)$	51.3	$\left(\frac{712}{1241}\right)$	57.4	$\left(\frac{1892}{33918}\right)$	5.6
Gold sample	$\left(\frac{2106}{3031}\right)$	69.5	$\left(\frac{597}{802}\right)$	74.4	–	–	$\left(\frac{28}{59}\right)$	47.5	$\left(\frac{769}{929}\right)$	82.8	–	–	$\left(\frac{712}{1241}\right)$	57.4	–	–
4FGL	$\left(\frac{1293}{1873}\right)$	69.0	$\left(\frac{533}{672}\right)$	79.3	–	–	–	–	$\left(\frac{334}{376}\right)$	88.8	–	–	$\left(\frac{426}{825}\right)$	51.6	–	–
BZCAT	$\left(\frac{1209}{1551}\right)$	77.9	$\left(\frac{64}{130}\right)$	49.2	$\left(\frac{6}{12}\right)$	50.0	$\left(\frac{28}{59}\right)$	47.5	$\left(\frac{435}{553}\right)$	78.7	–	–	$\left(\frac{28}{43}\right)$	65.1	–	–
3HSP	$\left(\frac{294}{400}\right)$	73.5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$\left(\frac{258}{364}\right)$	70.9	–	–
HighZ	$\left(\frac{6}{17}\right)$	35.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$\left(\frac{0}{9}\right)$	0.0	–	–
Milliquas	$\left(\frac{958}{1304}\right)$	73.5	–	–	$\left(\frac{72}{135}\right)$	53.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
KDEBLACS	$\left(\frac{495}{2091}\right)$	23.7	–	–	$\left(\frac{325}{1879}\right)$	17.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
WIBRaLS2	$\left(\frac{2406}{4133}\right)$	58.2	–	–	$\left(\frac{549}{1160}\right)$	47.3	–	–	–	–	$\left(\frac{913}{1799}\right)$	51.3	–	–	$\left(\frac{138}{171}\right)$	80.7
ABC	$\left(\frac{313}{704}\right)$	44.5	–	–	$\left(\frac{2}{2}\right)$	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$\left(\frac{283}{651}\right)$	43.5
BROS	$\left(\frac{2659}{35016}\right)$	7.6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$\left(\frac{1471}{33096}\right)$	4.4




Fig. 24. Fermi-LAT flux as a function of eROSITA flux, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3. The gray points are BlazEr1 sources, whereas sources without a significant detection are shown in color. Arrows display upper limits.

$F_{X,0.2-2.3 \text{ keV}} = 1 \times 10^{-14} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, indicates that the lower luminosity population is missed due to the sensitivity limit of eROSITA.

Similar to Fig. 17, we compare the X-ray upper limits to γ -ray fluxes in Fig. 24. The majority of non-detections correspond to BCUs, found at lower γ -ray fluxes than detected sources. Of the undetected blazars with a counterpart in the 4LAC catalog, the majority are LSPs (265 objects), ISPs and HSPs are less prominent (76 and 29, respectively). LSPs are expected to exhibit harder spectra, which hints at a potential bias towards softer and more high peaked objects, which are easier to detect. It is likely that all these sources were missed in eRASS1 due to being faint.

These results tell us that subsequent all-sky survey releases by eROSITA will have higher detection rates than the BlazEr1 catalog, as the faintness of the sources represents one of the main limitations for our catalog.

6. Summary and future work

We presented the **Blazars in eRASS1** (BlazEr1) catalog of blazars and blazar candidates detected by eROSITA on the western Galactic hemisphere. This catalog is available online through Vizier and at the eROSITA DR1 webpage¹⁰. The catalog was derived by matching a master list of blazars and blazar candidate sources from the literature, the BLAZE catalog, which is released together with this paper, to the eROSITA eRASS1 catalog (Merloni et al. 2024). After applying quality cuts, a set of 5865 eROSITA observed blazars and blazar candidates are detected. eROSITA sources removed during processing steps are released in a separate catalog. The BlazEr1 catalog is augmented with X-ray spectral and multiwavelength information (see Appendix D). To date, this catalog is the most complete compilation of confirmed X-ray detected blazars on the western Galactic hemisphere, and to our knowledge the largest catalog of X-ray detected blazars and blazar candidates. Overall, the BlazEr1 catalog is expected to contain at most 633 contaminating sources (Sect. 3.2).

The main scientific results obtained from an analysis of the catalog include the distribution of photon indices for the spectroscopic sample (Sect. 5.4), which clearly show that the different blazar sub-types exhibit distinct spectral properties, allowing tentative statements on the subtype based on the photon index. The relations between the spectral properties and fluxes and luminosities are consistent with expectations from the blazar sequence (Sect. 5.4). We find that eROSITA is more sensitive towards low-flux FSRQs than low-flux BLLs, probably due to very soft spectra displayed by the latter. Most of the brightest blazars detected are BLLs, while the fluxes of γ -ray detected sources are higher than those of the non γ -ray detected ones.

The slopes of the log N -log S distributions constructed from the catalog imply a negative cosmological evolution, both for the entire sample and for different sub-samples, meaning the objects are more common in the local Universe, although for the blazar candidates the value could indicate a slight positive evolution (Sect. 5.5). The observed distributions agree well with theoret-

¹⁰ https://erosita.mpe.mpg.de/dr1/AllSkySurveyData_dr1/Catalogues_dr1/

ical predictions (Giommi & Padovani 2015). We find evidence for a population inversion between *BLLs* and *FSRQs* at lower fluxes.

The spectral properties, fluxes, and luminosities of the *BCUs* are similar to low flux *BLLs*, consistent with other publications (Sect. 5.2; Kang et al. 2019; Peña-Herazo et al. 2020; Chiaro et al. 2021). The multiwavelength data help to separate blazars into their respective classes using color-color diagrams and highlights the importance of the *eROSITA* data for building a comprehensive blazar catalog, study their properties, as well as for future SED modeling (Sect. 5.7).

The BlazEr1 catalog can serve as a benchmark for overall blazar properties and single-object properties since it provides the first X-ray observation for many blazars. For instance, the *eROSITA* data will be crucial to constrain the SEDs of a large number of objects, including samples such as those from TANAMI, MOJAVE, or 4FGL. Earlier applications of the eRASS1 catalog included the identification of X-ray counterparts for an ultra-high-energy neutrino event (Adriani et al. 2025) and the identification of TeV blazar candidates for follow-up observations (Metzger et al. 2025; see also Marchesi et al. 2025).

Additionally, the *eROSITA* surveys allow for a detailed variability study on time scales of hours-days for the brightest and, on a half-year time line for all other sources. The BlazEr1 catalog provides the framework for these studies. Examples include work on X-ray blazar flares, as demonstrated, for instance, for PKS 0735+178 (Hämmerich et al. 2021b; Sahakyan et al. 2022) or a γ -ray flare of TXS 0646–176 (Hämmerich et al. 2021a).

A subsequent data release of 2.2 years of data (eRASS:5), will allow us to provide an updated, deeper version of the catalog. The cumulative *eROSITA* data will also deepen the catalog, making the eRASS:5 version of the catalog, which will contain 2.2 years of data, the deepest X-ray blazar catalog ever constructed.

Acknowledgements. S.H. is partly supported by the German Science Foundation (DFG grant numbers WI 1860/14-1 and 434448349). Mi.K. acknowledges support from DLR grant FKZ 50 OR 2307. Ma.K. and F.R. acknowledge funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation, grant 434448349). A.G.M. acknowledges support from Narodowe Centrum Nauki (NCN) grant 2018/31/G/ST9/03224. Ma.K. E.R. and J.W. gratefully acknowledge funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), within the research unit 5195 “Relativistic Jets in Active Galaxies” under project number 443220636. This work is part of the M2FINDERS (ERC grant No. 101018682) and ASTROGEODESY (ERC grant No. 101076060) projects, funded by the European Research Council under the EU Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme. This work is based on data from *eROSITA*, the soft X-ray instrument aboard SRG, a joint Russian-German science mission supported by the Russian Space Agency (Roskosmos), in the interests of the Russian Academy of Sciences represented by its Space Research Institute (IKI), and the Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt (DLR). The SRG spacecraft was built by Lavochkin Association (NPOL) and its subcontractors, and was operated by NPOL with support from the Max Planck Institute for Extraterrestrial Physics (MPE). The development and construction of the *eROSITA* X-ray instrument was led by MPE, with contributions from the Dr. Karl Remeis Observatory Bamberg and ECAP (FAU Erlangen-Nürnberg), the University of Hamburg Observatory, the Leibniz Institute for Astrophysics Potsdam (AIP), and the Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics of the University of Tübingen, with the support of DLR and the Max Planck Society. The Argelander Institute for Astronomy of the University of Bonn and the Ludwig Maximilians Universität Munich also participated in the science preparation for *eROSITA*. The *eROSITA* data shown here were processed using the eSASS/NRTA software system developed by the German *eROSITA* consortium. This research has made use of ISIS functions (ISISscripts) provided by ECAP/Remeis observatory and MIT (<https://www.sternwarte.uni-erlangen.de/isis/>). This research has made use of data, software and/or web tools obtained from the High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center (HEASARC), a service of the Astrophysics Science Division at NASA/GSFC and of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory’s High Energy Astrophysics Division, and of the VizieR and HEASARC database systems for querying objects and getting information from different cat-

alogs. We thank Tess Jaffe (GSFC) for valuable input concerning our HEASARC queries. This work has also made use of data from the European Space Agency (ESA) mission *Gaia* (<https://www.cosmos.esa.int/gaia>), processed by the *Gaia* Data Processing and Analysis Consortium (DPAC, <https://www.cosmos.esa.int/web/gaia/dpac/consortium>). Funding for the DPAC has been provided by national institutions, in particular the institutions participating in the *Gaia* Multilateral Agreement. The SIMBAD database, operated at CDS, Strasbourg, France, was also used to get additional information.

References

- Abdo, A. A., Ackermann, M., Agudo, I., et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 716, 30
- Abdo, A. A., Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 707, L142
- Abdollahi, S., Acero, F., Ackermann, M., et al. 2020, *ApJS*, 247, 33
- Abdollahi, S., Acero, F., Baldini, L., et al. 2022, *ApJS*, 260, 53
- Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., Atwood, W. B., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 810, 14
- Adriani, O., Aiello, S., Albert, A., et al. 2025, *ApJ*, submitted (arXiv:2502.08484)
- Agarwal, A., Gupta, A. C., Bachev, R., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 451, 3882
- Ahnen, M. L., Ansoldi, S., Antonelli, L. A., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 620, A181
- Ajello, M., Angioni, R., Axelsson, M., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 892, 105
- Ajello, M., Baldini, L., Ballet, J., et al. 2022, *ApJS*, 263, 24
- Ajello, M., Costamante, L., Sambruna, R. M., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 699, 603
- Ajello, M., Romani, R. W., Gasparrini, D., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 780, 73
- Ajello, M., Shaw, M. S., Romani, R. W., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 751, 108
- An, T., Wang, A., Liu, Y., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 519, 4047
- Antonucci, R. 1993, *ARA&A*, 31, 473
- Atwood, W. B., Abdo, A. A., Ackermann, M., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 697, 1071
- Belladitta, S., Bañados, E., Xie, Z.-L., et al. 2025, *A&A*, 699, A335
- Belladitta, S., Moretti, A., Caccianiga, A., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 629, A68
- Belladitta, S., Moretti, A., Caccianiga, A., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 635, L7
- Bellenghi, C., Padovani, P., Resconi, E., & Giommi, P. 2023, *ApJ*, 955, L32
- Beringer, J., Arguin, J. F., Barnett, R. M., et al. 2012, *Phys. Rev. D*, 86, 010001
- Blandford, R., Meier, D., & Readhead, A. 2019, *ARA&A*, 57, 467
- Blandford, R. D. & Königl, A. 1979, *ApJ*, 232, 34
- Blandford, R. D. & Rees, M. J. 1978, in *Pittsburgh Conference on BL Lac Objects*, ed. A. M. Wolfe (University of Pittsburgh Department of Physics and Astronomy), 328–341
- Bloom, S. D. & Marscher, A. P. 1996, *ApJ*, 461, 657
- Boller, Th., Freyberg, M. J., Trümper, J., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 588, A103
- Böttcher, M., Reimer, A., Sweeney, K., & Prakash, A. 2013, *ApJ*, 768, 54
- Brunner, H., Liu, T., Lamer, G., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 661, A1
- Caccianiga, A., Moretti, A., Belladitta, S., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 484, 204
- Cash, W. 1979, *ApJ*, 228, 939
- Chang, Y. L., Arsioli, B., Giommi, P., Padovani, P., & Brandt, C. H. 2019, *A&A*, 632, A77

- Chiaro, G., Kovacevic, M., & La Mura, G. 2021, *J. High En. Astrophys.*, 29, 40
- Ciaramella, A., Bongardo, C., Aller, H. D., et al. 2004, *A&A*, 419, 485
- Comastri, A., Fossati, G., Ghisellini, G., & Molendi, S. 1997, *ApJ*, 480, 534
- Coppejans, R., Frey, S., Cseh, D., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 463, 3260
- D’Abrusco, R., Álvarez Crespo, N., Massaro, F., et al. 2019, *ApJS*, 242, 4
- D’Abrusco, R., Massaro, F., Ajello, M., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 748, 68
- D’Ammando, F., Orienti, M., Finke, J., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 446, 2456
- Dauser, T., Falkner, S., Lorenz, M., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 630, A66
- de la Calle Pérez, I., Álvarez Crespo, N., Racero, E., & Rouco, A. 2021, *A&A*, 655, A48
- de Menezes, R., Peña-Herazo, H. A., Marchesini, E. J., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 630, A55
- de Vaucouleurs, G., de Vaucouleurs, A., & Corwin, H. G. 1976, *Second reference catalogue of bright galaxies* (University of Texas Press, Austin)
- Dermer, C. D. & Schlickeiser, R. 1993, *ApJ*, 416, 458
- Dey, A., Schlegel, D. J., Lang, D., et al. 2019, *AJ*, 157, 168
- Donato, D., Ghisellini, G., Tagliaferri, G., & Fossati, G. 2001, *A&A*, 375, 739
- Donato, D., Sambruna, R. M., & Gliozzi, M. 2005, *A&A*, 433, 1163
- Evans, P. A., Page, K. L., Osborne, J. P., et al. 2020, *ApJS*, 247, 54
- Fan, J. H., Yang, J. H., Yuan, Y. H., Wang, J., & Gao, Y. 2012, *ApJ*, 761, 125
- Finke, J. D. 2016, *ApJ*, 830, 94
- Fitzpatrick, E. L. 1999, *PASP*, 111, 63
- Flesch, E. W. 2023, *OJAp*, 6, 49
- Fossati, G., Maraschi, L., Celotti, A., Comastri, A., & Ghisellini, G. 1998, *MNRAS*, 299, 433
- Gatuzz, E., Wilms, J., Hämmerich, S., & Arcodia, R. 2024, *A&A*, 683, A213
- Gehrels, N. 1986, *ApJ*, 303, 336
- Ghisellini, G. 2013, in *EPJ Web Conf.*, Vol. 61 (EDP), 05001
- Ghisellini, G., Celotti, A., Fossati, G., Maraschi, L., & Comastri, A. 1998, *MNRAS*, 301, 451
- Ghisellini, G., Haardt, F., Ciardi, B., et al. 2015a, *MNRAS*, 452, 3457
- Ghisellini, G. & Madau, P. 1996, *MNRAS*, 280, 67
- Ghisellini, G., Sbarrato, T., Tagliaferri, G., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, L111
- Ghisellini, G., Tagliaferri, G., Sbarrato, T., & Gehrels, N. 2015b, *MNRAS*, 450, L34
- Ginzburg, V. L. & Syrovatskii, S. I. 1965, *ARA&A*, 3, 297
- Giommi, P., Brandt, C. H., Barres de Almeida, U., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 631, A116
- Giommi, P., Menna, M. T., & Padovani, P. 1999, *MNRAS*, 310, 465
- Giommi, P. & Padovani, P. 2015, *MNRAS*, 450, 2404
- Giommi, P., Padovani, P., & Perlman, E. 2000, *MNRAS*, 317, 743
- Giommi, P., Padovani, P., Polenta, G., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 420, 2899
- Gokus, A., Böttcher, M., Errando, M., et al. 2024a, *ApJ*, 974, 38
- Gokus, A., Errando, M., Agudo, I., et al. 2025, *ApJ*, 990, 206
- Gokus, A., Paliya, V. S., Wagner, S. M., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 649, A77
- Gokus, A., Wilms, J., Kadler, M., et al. 2024b, *MNRAS*, 529, 1450
- Gordon, Y. A., Rudnick, L., Andernach, H., et al. 2023, *ApJS*, 267, 37
- Hämmerich, S., Gokus, A., Kreykenbohm, I., Rau, A., & Wilms, J. 2021a, *ATel* 14991
- Hämmerich, S., Zainab, A., Gokus, A., et al. 2021b, *ATel* 15108
- Harrison, F. A., Craig, W. W., Christensen, F. E., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 770, 103
- Healey, S. E., Romani, R. W., Cotter, G., et al. 2008, *ApJS*, 175, 97
- HI4PI Collaboration. 2016, *A&A*, 594, A116
- Hinton, J. A. & Hofmann, W. 2009, *ARA&A*, 47, 523
- Homan, D. C., Cohen, M. H., Hovatta, T., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 923, 67
- Homan, D. C., Ojha, R., Wardle, J. F. C., et al. 2002, *ApJ*, 568, 99
- Houck, J. C. & Denicola, L. A. 2000, in *ASP Conf. Ser.*, Vol. 216, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems IX*, ed. N. Manset, C. Veillet, & D. Crabtree, 591
- Ighina, L., Caccianiga, A., Moretti, A., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 489, 2732
- Itoh, R., Utsumi, Y., Inoue, Y., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 901, 3
- Jones, T. W., O’Dell, S. L., & Stein, W. A. 1974, *ApJ*, 188, 353
- Kaastra, J. S. 2017, *A&A*, 605, A51
- Kaastra, J. S. & Bleeker, J. A. M. 2016, *A&A*, 587, A151
- Kadler, M. 2005, PhD thesis, Rheinische Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, Bonn, Germany
- Kang, S.-J., Li, E., Ou, W., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 887, 134
- Kapanadze, B. Z. 2013, *AJ*, 145, 31
- Keenan, M., Meyer, E. T., Georgopoulos, M., Reddy, K., & French, O. J. 2021, *MNRAS*, 505, 4726
- Khamitov, I. M., Bikmaev, I. F., Gilfanov, M. R., et al. 2022, *Astron. Lett.*, 48, 828
- Khorunzhev, G. A., Meshcheryakov, A. V., Medvedev, P. S., et al. 2021, *Astron. Lett.*, 47, 123
- Kluge, M., Comparat, J., Liu, A., et al. 2024, *A&A*, 688, A210
- Komossa, S., Voges, W., Xu, D., et al. 2006, *AJ*, 132, 531
- König, O., Wilms, J., Arcodia, R., et al. 2022, *Nature*, 605, 248
- Kovlakas, K., Zezas, A., Andrews, J. J., et al. 2021, *MNRAS*, 506, 1896
- Krauß, F., Kreter, M., Müller, C., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 610, L8
- Krauß, F., Wilms, J., Kadler, M., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 591, A130
- Kreter, M., Gokus, A., Krauss, F., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 903, 128
- Kudenko, M. & Troitsky, S. 2024, *A&A*, 686, A178
- Lacy, M., Baum, S. A., Chandler, C. J., et al. 2020, *PASP*, 132, 035001
- Langejahn, M., Kadler, M., Wilms, J., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 637, A55
- Lien, A. Y., Krimm, H. A., Markwardt, C. B., et al. 2025, *ApJ*, 989, 161
- Liodakis, I. & Petropoulou, M. 2020, *ApJ*, 893, L20
- Lister, M. L., Homan, D. C., Kellermann, K. I., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 923, 30
- Maccacaro, T., Romaine, S., & Schmitt, H. M. M. 1987, in *IAU Symposium*, Vol. 124, *Observational Cosmology*, ed. A. Hewitt, G. Burbidge, & L. Z. Fang (IAU), 597
- Madejski, G. G. & Sikora, M. 2016, *ARA&A*, 54, 725
- Mannheim, K. 1993, *A&A*, 269, 67
- Mannheim, K. & Biermann, P. L. 1992, *A&A*, 253, L21
- Maraschi, L., Ghisellini, G., & Celotti, A. 1992, *ApJ*, 397, L5
- Marchesi, S., Iuliano, A., Prandini, E., et al. 2025, *A&A*, 693, A142
- Marcotulli, L., Ajello, M., Urry, C. M., et al. 2022, *ApJ*, 940, 77
- Marcotulli, L., Connor, T., Bañados, E., et al. 2025, *ApJ*, 979, L6
- Marscher, A. P. & Gear, W. K. 1985, *ApJ*, 298, 114

- Martí, J., Sánchez-Ayaso, E., Luque-Escamilla, P. L., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 492, 4291
- Massaro, E., Maselli, A., Leto, C., et al. 2015, *Ap&SS*, 357, 75
- Massaro, E., Tramacere, A., Perri, M., Giommi, P., & Tosti, G. 2006, *A&A*, 448, 861
- Massaro, F., D’Abrusco, R., Ajello, M., Grindlay, J. E., & Smith, H. A. 2011, *ApJ*, 740, L48
- Massaro, F., D’Abrusco, R., Tosti, G., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 750, 138
- Mattox, J. R., Bertsch, D. L., Chiang, J., et al. 1993, *ApJ*, 410, 609
- Medvedev, P., Sazonov, S., Gilfanov, M., et al. 2020, *MNRAS*, 497, 1842
- Mereghetti, S., Tiengo, A., Esposito, P., et al. 2009, *Science*, 325, 1222
- Merloni, A., Lamer, G., Liu, T., et al. 2024, *A&A*, 682, A34
- Merloni, A., Predehl, P., Becker, W., et al. 2012, *ArXiv e-prints* [arXiv:1209.3114]
- Metzger, C., Gokus, A., & Errando, M. 2025, *ApJ*, 992, 184
- Middei, R., Giommi, P., Perri, M., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 514, 3179
- Mücke, A. & Protheroe, R. J. 2001, *Astropart. Phys.*, 15, 121
- Mücke, A., Protheroe, R. J., Engel, R., Rachen, J. P., & Stanev, T. 2003, *Astropart. Phys.*, 18, 593
- Müller, C., Kadler, M., Ojha, R., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 610, A1
- Müller, C., Krauß, F., Dauser, T., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 574, A117
- O’Dowd, M., Urry, C. M., & Scarpa, R. 2002, *ApJ*, 580, 96
- Ojha, R., Kadler, M., Böck, M., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 519, A45
- Padovani, P. & Giommi, P. 1996, *MNRAS*, 279, 526
- Paggi, A., Bonato, M., Raiteri, C. M., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 641, A62
- Paliya, V. S., Ajello, M., Rakshit, S., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 853, L2
- Paliya, V. S., Marcotulli, L., Ajello, M., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 851, 33
- Paliya, V. S. & Stalin, C. S. 2016, *ApJ*, 820, 52
- Park, T., Kashyap, V. L., Siemiginowska, A., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 652, 610
- Peña-Herazo, H. A., Amaya-Almazán, R. A., Massaro, F., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 643, A103
- Perlman, E. S., Stocke, J. T., Schachter, J. F., et al. 1996a, *ApJS*, 104, 251
- Perlman, E. S., Stocke, J. T., Wang, Q. D., & Morris, S. L. 1996b, *ApJ*, 456, 451
- Petrov, L. Y. & Kovalev, Y. Y. 2025, *ApJS*, 276, 38
- Pian, E., Vacanti, G., Tagliaferri, G., et al. 1998, *ApJ*, 492, L17
- Pineau, F. X., Derriere, S., Motch, C., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 597, A89
- Predehl, P., Andritschke, R., Arefiev, V., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 647, A1
- Rajput, B., Stalin, C. S., & Rakshit, S. 2020, *A&A*, 634, A80
- Rakshit, S., Stalin, C. S., Chand, H., & Zhang, X.-G. 2017, *ApJS*, 229, 39
- Rector, T. A., Stocke, J. T., Perlman, E. S., Morris, S. L., & Gioia, I. M. 2000, *AJ*, 120, 1626
- Rees, M. J. 1967, *MNRAS*, 137, 429
- Rigoselli, M., De Grandis, D., Mereghetti, S., & Malacaria, C. 2023, *MNRAS*, 523, 3043
- Romani, R. W., Sowards-Emmerd, D., Greenhill, L., & Michelson, P. 2004, *ApJ*, 610, L9
- Sahakyan, N., Giommi, P., Padovani, P., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 519, 1396
- Sahu, S., López Fortín, C. E., Valadez Polanco, I. A., & Rajpoot, S. 2021, *ApJ*, 914, 120
- Salvato, M., Buchner, J., Budavári, T., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 473, 4937
- Salvato, M., Wolf, J., Dwelly, T., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 661, A3
- Salvato, M., Wolf, J., Dwelly, T., et al. 2025, *A&A*, accepted (arXiv:2509.02842)
- Sambruna, R. M., Barr, P., Giommi, P., et al. 1994a, *ApJS*, 95, 371
- Sambruna, R. M., Barr, P., Giommi, P., et al. 1994b, *ApJ*, 434, 468
- Saxena, A., Salvato, M., Roster, W., et al. 2024, *A&A*, 690, A365
- Sbarrato, T., Ghisellini, G., Nardini, M., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 426, L91
- Sbarrato, T., Ghisellini, G., Nardini, M., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 433, 2182
- Sbarrato, T., Ghisellini, G., Tagliaferri, G., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 446, 2483
- Sbarrato, T., Ghisellini, G., Tagliaferri, G., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 663, A147
- Schlickeiser, R. 1996, *A&AS*, 120, 481
- Seppi, R., Comparat, J., Bulbul, E., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 665, A78
- Shemmer, O., Brandt, W. N., Schneider, D. P., et al. 2006, *ApJ*, 644, 86
- Sikora, M., Begelman, M. C., & Rees, M. J. 1994, *ApJ*, 421, 153
- Singh, V. & Chand, H. 2018, *MNRAS*, 480, 1796
- Sowards-Emmerd, D., Romani, R. W., & Michelson, P. F. 2003, *ApJ*, 590, 109
- Stickel, M., Padovani, P., Urry, C. M., Fried, J. W., & Kuehr, H. 1991, *ApJ*, 374, 431
- Stocke, J. T., Morris, S. L., Gioia, I. M., et al. 1991, *ApJS*, 76, 813
- Sunyaev, R., Arefiev, V., Babyshkin, V., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 656, A132
- Tanihata, C., Urry, C. M., Takahashi, T., et al. 2001, *ApJ*, 563, 569
- Toda, K., Inoue, Y., Tanaka, Y., & Fukazawa, Y. 2017, in 7 years of MAXI: monitoring X-ray Transients, ed. M. Serino, M. Shidatsu, W. Iwakiri, & T. Mihara (The Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN), Wako, Saitama, Japan), 221
- Tomsick, J., Boggs, S., Zoglauer, A., et al. 2024, in 38th International Cosmic Ray Conference, PoS(ICRC2023) (Trieste: PoS), 745
- Tomsick, J., Zoglauer, A., Sleator, C., et al. 2019, *BAAS*, 51, 98
- Truemper, J. 1982, *Adv. Space Res.*, 2, 241
- Truemper, J. 1993, *Sci.*, 260, 1769
- Tubín-Arenas, D., Krumpe, M., Lamer, G., et al. 2024, *A&A*, 682, A35
- Turiziani, S., Cavazzuti, E., & Giommi, P. 2007, *A&A*, 472, 699
- Turiziani, S., Fraga, B., & Giommi, P. 2019, *MNRAS*, 489, 3307
- Urry, C. M. 1996, in ASP Conf. Ser., Vol. 110, *Blazar Continuum Variability*, ed. H. R. Miller, J. R. Webb, & J. C. Noble (Astronomical Society Pacific), 391
- Urry, C. M. & Padovani, P. 1995, *PASP*, 107, 803
- Urry, C. M., Sambruna, R. M., Worrall, D. M., et al. 1996, *ApJ*, 463, 424
- Urry, C. M., Scarpa, R., O’Dowd, M., et al. 2000, *ApJ*, 532, 816
- Verner, D. A., Ferland, G. J., Korista, K. T., & Yakovlev, D. G. 1996, *ApJ*, 465, 487
- Véron-Cetty, M. P. & Véron, P. 2010, *A&A*, 518, A10
- Voges, W., Aschenbach, B., Boller, T., et al. 2000, *IAU Circ.*, 7432, 3
- Voges, W., Aschenbach, B., Boller, Th., et al. 1999, *A&A*, 349, 389
- Wenger, M., Ochsenein, F., Egret, D., et al. 2000, *A&AS*, 143, 9
- Wilms, J., Allen, A., & McCray, R. 2000, *ApJ*, 542, 914

- Wolf, J., Salvato, M., Belladitta, S., et al. 2024, *A&A*, 691, A30
- Wolter, A. & Celotti, A. 2001, *A&A*, 371, 527
- Worrall, D. M. & Wilkes, B. J. 1990, *ApJ*, 360, 396
- Worsley, M. A., Fabian, A. C., Turner, A. K., Celotti, A., & Iwasawa, K. 2004, *MNRAS*, 350, 207
- Xie, Z.-L., Bañados, E., Belladitta, S., et al. 2024, *ApJ*, 964, 98
- Yuan, W., Fabian, A. C., Celotti, A., & Jonker, P. G. 2003, *MNRAS*, 346, L7
- Yuan, W., Matsuoka, M., & Ueno, S. 2000, *BAAS*, 32, 1183
- Yuan, Y. & Fan, J. 2014, *Ap&SS*, 352, 207

Appendix A: Supplemental figures

In this Appendix we extend the discussion of the main part of this paper with further diagnostic information. Figures A.1 and A.2 display the distributions of the normalized angular separation with respect to S25. In Fig. A.3 the fits to the log N -log S distributions are shown and Fig. A.4 summarizes the relation between SED parameters and broadband spectral indices.




Fig. A.1. Histograms of the angular separation between the positions provided in the BLAZE catalog normalized by the respective *eROSITA* positional error. The upper panels display the *eROSITA* observed blazars and the lower panels the *eROSITA* observed blazar candidates. In panels a and c we show all the initial matches. In panels b and d, we show the BlazEr1 sample with applied quality and separation cuts. The theoretical Rayleigh distributions are shown as a black solid line.




Fig. A.2. Similar to Fig. A.1, we show the separation between *eROSITA* and LS10 counterparts by S25 in yellow. All matches with the LS10 counterpart catalog are shown in panels a and d, whereas panels b–f only show sources where S25 provides the same or a different counterpart, respectively.




Fig. A.3. log N -log S distributions of different BlazEr1 subsamples, similar to Fig. 14 but for the *eROSITA* main band and including the fit results listed in Table 5. The color scheme is the same as in Fig. 14. The red line in the left panel shows the best fit broken power law for the entire sample ($\alpha_1 = 1.003 \pm 0.013$, $\alpha_2 = 1.39 \pm 0.07$, $F_{X,\text{break},0.2-2.3\text{ keV}} = (2.11 \pm 0.26) \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, $C = 30.6 \pm 2.5 \text{ deg}^{-2}$).




Fig. A.4. SED parameters from the 4LAC catalog as a function of various broadband spectral indices, following the color scheme introduced in Fig. 3.

Appendix B: Supplemental tables

In this Appendix we present the tables summarizing the different correlations and the mean values of the broadband spectral indices. Table B.1 lists all kinds of different parameter combinations and the respective correlation values, while Table B.2 compares the broadband spectral indices with the SED parameters and Table B.3 lists correlation coefficients between the different broadband spectral indices. Mean values for the broadband spectral indices are given in Table B.4.

Table B.1. Correlation coefficients for various parameter combinations discussed throughout the paper.

Parameter 1	Parameter 2	Sample	ρ_{Pearson}	p	τ_{Kendall}	p
<i>eROSITA</i> flux	<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	<i>BLL</i>	−0.1217	0.022	−0.1834	< 0.003
<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	z	<i>FSRQ</i>	−0.4438	< 0.003	−0.2789	< 0.003
<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	z	<i>FSRQC</i>	−0.3248	0.009	−0.2360	0.006
<i>Swift</i> -BAT flux	<i>eROSITA</i> flux	<i>FSRQ</i>	0.9695	0.0	0.0719	0.499
<i>Swift</i> -BAT flux	<i>eROSITA</i> flux	<i>BCU</i>	0.9418	< 0.003	0.3590	0.100
<i>NuSTAR</i> soft flux	<i>eROSITA</i> flux	all	0.6950	< 0.003	0.5382	< 0.003
<i>NuSTAR</i> hard flux	<i>eROSITA</i> flux	all	0.6060	< 0.003	0.2707	0.008
<i>NuSTAR</i> Γ_X	<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	all	0.6118	< 0.003	–	–
<i>Swift</i> -BAT Γ_X	<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	all	0.4794	< 0.003	–	–
<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	<i>Fermi</i> -LAT Γ_γ	<i>BCU</i>	−0.1288	0.141	−0.1999	0.001
TANAMI flux density	<i>eROSITA</i> flux	<i>FSRQ</i>	0.5503	0.001	0.5907	< 0.003
MOJAVE flux density	<i>eROSITA</i>	all	0.5055	< 0.003	0.2941	< 0.003
RFC X-band flux density	<i>eROSITA</i>	<i>FSRQ</i>	0.2513	< 0.003	0.2958	0.0
RFC X-band flux density	<i>eROSITA</i>	<i>BLL</i>	0.0455	0.349	−0.1395	< 0.003
<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	α_{IRX}	<i>BLL</i>	0.2148	< 0.003	0.2098	< 0.003
<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	α_{OX}	<i>BLL</i>	0.2963	< 0.003	0.2422	< 0.003
<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	$\alpha_{\text{X}\Gamma}$	<i>BLL</i>	−0.2305	< 0.003	−0.2669	< 0.003
<i>eROSITA</i> Γ_X	α_{RX}	all	−0.4171	< 0.003	−0.3437	0.0
$\alpha_{\text{X}\Gamma}$	z	all	−0.3973	< 0.003	−0.3002	0.0
α_{RX}	z	all	0.4405	0.0	0.3362	0.0

Table B.2. Correlation coefficients for parameters α and SED parameters from the 4LAC catalog.

α	Class	HE peak				LE peak				Compton dominance			
		ρ_{Pearson}	p	τ_{Kendall}	p	ρ_{Pearson}	p	τ_{Kendall}	p	ρ_{Pearson}	p	τ_{Kendall}	p
$\alpha_{\text{X}\Gamma}$	all	0.0876	0.004	0.3860	0.0	0.0759	0.008	0.1893	0.0	–	–	−0.2117	0.0
	<i>BLL</i>	0.0953	0.041	0.4768	0.0	0.0872	0.045	0.2957	0.0	–	–	−0.1937	<0.003
	<i>FSRQ</i>	0.0345	0.557	−0.0770	0.050	−0.0298	0.592	−0.0128	0.731	–	–	−0.2930	<0.003
α_{IRX}	all	−0.0827	0.019	−0.2409	0.0	−0.1029	0.002	−0.0829	<0.003	–	–	0.0352	0.115
	<i>BLL</i>	−0.0939	0.077	−0.4666	0.0	−0.1845	<0.003	−0.2943	0.0	–	–	0.0890	0.008
	<i>FSRQ</i>	0.1445	0.030	0.1366	0.002	−0.0175	0.780	0.2180	<0.003	–	–	0.0263	0.534
α_{OX}	all	−0.0907	0.012	−0.1285	<0.003	−0.0802	0.017	−0.0218	0.336	–	–	−0.0085	0.707
	<i>BLL</i>	−0.1170	0.030	−0.3393	0.0	−0.1531	0.002	−0.1924	<0.003	–	–	0.0386	0.258
	<i>FSRQ</i>	0.1033	0.128	0.0193	0.672	0.0170	0.789	0.1395	0.001	–	–	0.0185	0.667
α_{RX}	all	−0.0755	0.027	−0.4319	0.0	−0.2519	<0.003	−0.3725	0.0	–	–	0.1651	<0.003
	<i>BLL</i>	−0.0701	0.201	−0.5639	0.0	−0.2824	<0.003	−0.5004	0.0	–	–	0.1582	<0.003
	<i>FSRQ</i>	−0.1242	0.036	0.0474	0.233	−0.0930	0.097	−0.2241	<0.003	–	–	0.0925	0.014

Table B.3. Correlation coefficients for parameters α .

α	Class	α_{IRX}				α_{OX}				α_{RX}			
		ρ_{Pearson}	p	τ_{Kendall}	p	ρ_{Pearson}	p	τ_{Kendall}	p	ρ_{Pearson}	p	τ_{Kendall}	p
$\alpha_{\text{X}\Gamma}$	all	−0.7532	<0.003	−0.5500	0.0	−0.5296	<0.003	−0.3722	0.0	−0.7560	<0.003	−0.4981	0.0
	<i>BLL</i>	−0.8633	<0.003	−0.6974	0.0	−0.7000	<0.003	−0.5526	0.0	−0.8582	<0.003	−0.6680	0.0
	<i>FSRQ</i>	−0.5380	<0.003	−0.3879	0.0	−0.2977	<0.003	−0.1975	<0.003	−0.4911	<0.003	−0.3080	<0.003
α_{IRX}	all	–	–	–	–	0.7786	0.0	0.5216	0.0	0.3500	0.0	0.1338	0.0
	<i>BLL</i>	–	–	–	–	0.9292	0.0	0.7791	0.0	0.8374	0.0	0.6498	0.0
	<i>FSRQ</i>	–	–	–	–	0.5807	0.0	0.3663	0.0	0.1459	0.001	0.0943	0.001
α_{OX}	all	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.1603	<0.003	0.0465	0.003
	<i>BLL</i>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.5997	0.0	0.4274	0.0
	<i>FSRQ</i>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.0397	0.351	0.0518	0.068

Table B.4. Mean and standard deviation values for parameters of α .

Type	$\langle\alpha_{\mathrm{X}\Gamma}\rangle$	$\sigma_{\alpha_{\mathrm{X}\Gamma}}$	$\langle\alpha_{\mathrm{I}\mathrm{RX}}\rangle$	$\sigma_{\alpha_{\mathrm{I}\mathrm{RX}}}$	$\langle\alpha_{\mathrm{O}\mathrm{X}}\rangle$	$\sigma_{\alpha_{\mathrm{O}\mathrm{X}}}$	$\langle\alpha_{\mathrm{R}\mathrm{X}}\rangle$	$\sigma_{\alpha_{\mathrm{R}\mathrm{X}}}$
All	1.04	0.11	1.15	0.14	1.25	0.21	0.84	0.10
Confirmed	1.04	0.11	1.13	0.16	1.22	0.21	0.84	0.12
Candidates	–	–	1.17	0.13	1.27	0.21	0.85	0.07
<i>BLL</i>	1.07	0.12	1.12	0.21	1.21	0.24	0.75	0.13
<i>BLLC</i>	–	–	1.20	0.13	1.29	0.19	0.80	0.07
<i>BZG</i>	–	–	1.27	0.19	1.48	0.27	0.78	0.09
<i>FSRQ</i>	0.98	0.08	1.15	0.10	1.25	0.16	0.89	0.06
<i>FSRQC</i>	–	–	1.16	0.09	1.31	0.18	0.84	0.06
<i>BCU</i>	1.04	0.10	1.12	0.16	1.18	0.21	0.82	0.11
<i>BCUC</i>	–	–	1.15	0.15	1.25	0.24	0.86	0.06

Appendix C: The BLAZE catalogs

The BLAZE catalog is obtained by merging the catalogs listed in Table 1 with the respective merging radii (Sect. 2). The BLAZE catalog contains redshifts from these input catalogs. Based on *eROSITA*'s sensitivity and exposure, we are able to calculate flux and luminosity upper limits for all sources in the western Galactic hemisphere. The sources removed due to quality issues (see Sect. 2.2) are released as a separate file as well. The catalogs are released as FITS files with the following columns:

SRC_NAME: Common name of the source.
 RAJ2000, DEJ2000: Equatorial coordinates from input catalog [°, J2000.0].
 LII, BII: Galactic coordinates from input catalog [°].
 BLAZAR_CLASS: Classification given by the input catalog.
 Z: Redshift given in the input catalog.
 Z_REF: Reference for the redshift.
 ERO_EXPO: *eROSITA* exposure time at source position, if available [s].
 ERO_UL_FLUX: Upper limit 0.2–2.3 keV flux, based on exposure time and sensitivity [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].
 ERO_UL_LUM: Upper limit for the 0.2–2.3 keV luminosity band based on ERO_UL_FLUX [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].
 REMOVE_FLAG: Only for the *unverified* BLAZE catalog, reason for removal: 1: HECATE, 2: Xie et al. (2024), 3: Rakshit et al. (2017), 4: Gordon et al. (2023), 5: known non-blazar.

Appendix D: The BlazEr1 catalogs

In the following we describe all 661 FITS columns of the BlazEr1 catalogs, that is, the *unverified* and the standard BlazEr1 catalog. As described in Sect. 3.1.1, these catalogs were obtained by merging various input catalogs, which are matched with the eRASS1 catalog (Merloni et al. 2024), and amending this list of sources with additional information such as, for example, spectral fit results. In the following the energy bands for X-ray and γ -ray fluxes and luminosities are denoted with n , where n is defined in Table D.1. For the fluxes determined by fitting a power law with fixed photon index to the spectra we denote the photon index G used, as listed in Table D.2. The LS10 bands (G, R, I, Z, W1, W2, W3, and W4) are denoted by X in the column names listed below. For RFC values the bands (s, c, x, u, and k) are denoted by Y . Not all parameters will have all of the bands available denoted with X . Where parameters have uncertainties, they are consistently listed in a column obtained by appending $_ERR$ to the column name. For symmetric error bars the column is a standard FITS column, asymmetric confidence intervals of the type P_{-l}^{+u} are given as fixed length arrays with two entries, $-l$ and $+u$, including the sign. Sometimes symmetric and asymmetric uncertainties are given, since some methods return asymmetric uncertainties which then are approximately summarized as symmetric ones ($_ERR$, $_ASYM_ERR$). In the online Vizier version the asymmetric uncertainty columns are prefixed by E_{-} and e_{-} for upper and lower uncertainties, respectively. Unless noted otherwise, confidence intervals are given at the 1σ confidence level, except for spectral parameters (e.g., photon indices, fluxes), where 90% confidence intervals are given, following the conventions of X-ray astronomy. Sometimes the inverse variance ($_IVAR$) is given instead of an uncertainty. Where columns are taken from other catalogs, we sometimes copy in part the original column descriptions in verbatim.

SRC_NAME: Common name of the source.

Table D.1. X-ray and γ -ray energy band designators used in the BlazEr1 catalog.

channel n	energy band
0	0.2–2.3 keV
1	0.2–2.3 keV
P1	0.2–0.5 keV
P2	0.5–1.0 keV
P3	1.0–2.0 keV
P4	2.0–5.0 keV
P5	5.0–8.0 keV
P6	4.0–10.0 keV
P7	5.1–6.1 keV
P8	6.2–7.1 keV
P9	7.2–8.2 keV
S	0.5–2.0 keV
T	0.2–10.0 keV
U	0.1–2.4 keV
V	0.3–10.0 keV
X	3.0–10.0 keV
Y	10.0–30.0 keV
Z	14.0–195.0 keV
A	0.1–100.0 GeV
B	1.0–100.0 GeV

Table D.2. Photon index designators G for flux values

Photon index	1.5	1.7	2.0	2.3
G	15	17	20	23

RAJ2000, DEJ2000: Equatorial coordinates from input catalog [°].
 BLAZAR_CLASS: Blazar classification given by the input catalog.
 CONF_BLAZAR: 1 for confirmed blazars and 0 for candidates.
 FGL_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in 4FGL (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).
 BZCAT_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in BZCAT (Massaro et al. 2015).
 HSP_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in 3HSP (Chang et al. 2019).
 HIGHZ_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in the HighZ sample (Sbaratto et al. 2025, in prep.)
 MILLIQUAS_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in Milliquas (Flesch 2023).
 KDEBLACS_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in KDEBLACS (D'Abrusco et al. 2019).
 WIBRALS2_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in WIBRALS2 (D'Abrusco et al. 2019).
 ABC_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in ABC (Paggi et al. 2020).
 BROS_SRC_NAME: Name of source if listed in BROS (Itoh et al. 2020).
 ANGSEP: Angular separation between catalog and *eROSITA* position [°].
 DETUID: *eROSITA* unique detection ID.
 IAUNAME: Official IAU name of the *eROSITA* source.
 SKYTILE: *eROSITA* sky tile ID.
 ID_SRC: *eROSITA* source ID in each sky tile.
 UID: Integer unique detection ID. See Merloni et al. (2024) for details.
 UID_HARD: Hard catalog UID of the source with a strong association, or -UID if the association is weak. 0 means no counterpart found in the Hard catalog.

ID_CLUSTER: Group ID of sources simultaneously modeled during source detection.

RA(_ERR), DEC(_ERR): Equatorial coordinates and associated uncertainties of *eROSITA* source (ICRS) [°].

RA_RAW(_ERR), DEC_RAW(_ERR): Equatorial coordinates of *eROSITA* source (ICRS), without applying the *eROSITA* aspect correction [°].

POS_ERR: 1σ position uncertainty [″].

RADEC_ERR: Combined positional error, raw output from PSF fitting [″].

LII, BII: Galactic coordinates of *eROSITA* source with applied position correction (not identical to the coordinates listed by [Merloni et al. 2024](#)) [°].

ELON, ELAT: Ecliptic coordinates of *eROSITA* source [°].

MJD: Modified Julian Date of the observation of the source nearest to the optical axis of *eROSITA*.

MJD_MIN, MJD_MAX: Modified Julian Date of the sources' first and last *eROSITA* observation.

EXT(_ERR, _ASYM_ERR): Source extent parameter and associated uncertainty [″].

EXT_LIKE: Extent likelihood.

DET_LIKE_n: Detection likelihood.

ML_CTS_n(_ERR, _ASYM_ERR): ML source net counts and associated uncertainty [cts].

ML_RATE_n(_ERR, _ASYM_ERR): ML source count rate and associated uncertainty [cts s⁻¹].

ML_FLUX_n(_ERR, _ASYM_ERR): ML source flux and associated uncertainty [erg cm⁻² s⁻¹].

ML_BKG_n: ML background counts at the source position [(′)⁻²].

ML_EXP_n: ML vignetted exposure time at the source position [s].

ML_EEF_n: ML enclosed energy fraction.

APE_CTS_n: Total counts extracted within the aperture [cts].

APE_BKG_n: Background counts extracted within the aperture, excluding nearby sources using the source map [cts].

APE_EXP_n: Exposure map value at the given position [s].

APE_RADIUS_n: Extraction radius [pixel, 1 pixel corresponds to 4″].

APE_POIS_n: Poisson probability that the extracted counts (APE_CTS) are background fluctuation.

FLAG_SP_SNR: If 1, source may lie within an overdense region near a supernova remnant.

FLAG_SP_BPS: If 1, source may lie within an overdense region near a bright point source.

FLAG_SP_SCL: If 1, source may lie within an overdense region near a stellar cluster.

FLAG_SP_LGA: If 1, source may lie within an overdense region near a local large galaxy.

FLAG_SP_GC_CONS: If 1, source may lie within an overdense region near a galaxy cluster.

FLAG_NO_RADEC_ERR: If 1, source contained no RA_DEC_ERR in the pre-processed version of the catalog.

FLAG_NO_EXT_ERR: If 1, source contained no EXT_ERR in the pre-processed version of the catalog.

FLAG_NO_CTS_ERR: If 1, source contained no ML_CTS_0_ERR in the pre-processed version of the catalog.

FLAG_OPT: If 1, source matched within 15″ with a bright optical star, likely contaminated by optical loading.

CTS_n(_ERR): Counts from spectrum and associated uncertainty ([Gehrels 1986](#)) [cts].

SPEC_EXPOTIME: Exposure time as given in the spectrum [s].

EXPOTIME: Exposure time from the *eROSITA* exposure map for the 0.2–2.3 keV band [s].

MIN_FLUX_95: Minimum detectable flux at source position to guarantee 95% detection rate with a DET_LIKE_0 of 10 or greater in the 0.2–2.3 keV band [erg cm⁻² s⁻¹].

AVERAGE_NH: Average N_H from the [HI4PI Collaboration \(2016\)](#) [cm⁻²].

WE_AVERAGE_NH: Weighted average N_H from the [HI4PI Collaboration \(2016\)](#) [cm⁻²].

HR12(_ERR): Hardness ratio between 0.2–0.7 keV and 0.7–1.2 keV and associated uncertainty.

HR23(_ERR): Hardness ratio between 0.7–1.2 keV and 1.2–2.3 keV and associated uncertainty.

HR13(_ERR): Hardness ratio between 0.2–0.7 keV and 1.2–2.3 keV and associated uncertainty.

PWLG_NORM(_ERR): Power law norm using a fixed N_H and an index of G at 1 keV and associated uncertainty [photons keV⁻¹ cm⁻² s⁻¹].

PWLG_FLUX(_UNABS, _ABS)_n(_ERR): Fitted unabsorbed and observed flux using a fixed N_H and fixed power law index G and associated uncertainty [erg cm⁻² s⁻¹].

PWLG_C_VARIANCE: Variance of Cash statistics of fixed N_H and fixed power law index fit according to [Kaastra \(2017\)](#).

PWLG_CASH: Cash statistics of fixed N_H and fixed power law index fit.

PWLG_CSTAT_THEORY: Theoretical Cash statistics while using a fixed N_H and fixed power law index fit according to [Kaastra \(2017\)](#).

PWLG_REDCASH: Reduced Cash statistics from fit with fixed N_H and fixed power law index.

PWLG_CASHBINS: Number of bins used during the fixed N_H and fixed power law index fit.

PWLG_CASHPAR: Number of parameters used during the fixed N_H and fixed power law index fit.

PWLG_NUM_BINS: Number of bins used to calculate [Kaastra \(2017\)](#) values of fixed N_H and fixed power law index.

Flux_JY(_ERR): Flux density at 1 keV derived from the norm of the fixed $\Gamma_X = 2.0$ fit [Jy].

(FREE_, FIXED_)NH(_ERR): Freely fitted or fixed N_H and associated uncertainty [cm⁻²].

(FREE_, FIXED_)GAMMA(_ERR): Power law photon index using a free or fixed N_H and associated uncertainty.

(FREE_, FIXED_)NORM(_ERR): Power law norm using a free or fixed N_H at 1 keV and associated uncertainty [photons keV⁻¹ cm⁻² s⁻¹].

(FREE_, FIXED_)FLUX(_UNABS, _ABS)_n(_ERR): Fitted unabsorbed and observed flux for a free or fixed N_H power law fit and associated uncertainty [erg cm⁻² s⁻¹].

(FREE_, FIXED_)C_VARIANCE: Variance of Cash statistics of free or fixed N_H power law fit according to [Kaastra \(2017\)](#).

(FREE_, FIXED_)CASH: Cash statistics of free or fixed N_H power law fit.

(FREE_, FIXED_)CSTATS_THEORY: Theoretical Cash statistics while using a free or fixed N_H power law fit according to [Kaastra \(2017\)](#).

(FREE_, FIXED_)REDCASH: Reduced Cash statistics from fit with free or fixed N_H .

(FREE_, FIXED_)CASHBINSs: Number of bins used during the free or fixed N_H power law fit.

(FREE_, FIXED_)CASHPAR: Number of parameters used during the free or fixed N_H power law fit.

(FREE_, FIXED_)NUM_BINS: Number of bins used to calculate [Kaastra \(2017\)](#) values of free or fixed N_H power law fit.

RXS_RA, RXS_DEC: Equatorial position of 2RXS source ([Boller et al. 2016](#)) [°].

RXS_NH_GAL: Galactic N_{H} assumed by Boller et al. (2016) [cm^{-2}].	FGL_FLUX_n(_ERR): Integral photon flux and associated uncertainty for the B band (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [$\text{photons cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].
RXS_NH: N_{H} derived from fit by Boller et al. (2016) [cm^{-2}].	FGL_FLUX_n(_ERR): Energy flux and associated uncertainty for the A band (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].
RXS_GAMMA(_ERR): Γ_{X} from fit and associated uncertainty by Boller et al. (2016) .	FGL_SPEC_TYPE: Spectral type in the global model (Power Law, LogParabola, PLSuperExpCutoff) (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).
RXS_FLUX_n: Flux from power law fit by Boller et al. (2016) [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].	FGL_PL_FLUXDEN(_ERR): Differential flux at pivot energy of the power law fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [$\text{cm}^{-2} \text{MeV}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$].
XRT_SRC_NAME: Name given in Evans et al. (2020) .	FGL_PL_INDEX(_ERR): Photon index of power law fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).
XRT_RA, XRT_DEC: Equatorial coordinates from Evans et al. (2020) [$^{\circ}$].	FGL_LP_FLUXDEN(_ERR): Differential flux at pivot energy of the LogPar fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [$\text{cm}^{-2} \text{MeV}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$].
XRT_XRT_ANGSEP: Angular separation between blazar catalog source and closest source in Evans et al. (2020) [$''$].	FGL_LP_INDEX(_ERR): Photon index at pivot energy for LogPar fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).
XRT_FLAG: If 1 the blazar and the source listed by Evans et al. (2020) are located within $8''$ of each other.	FGL_LP_BETA(_ERR): Curvature parameter of LogPar fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).
XRT_NH(_ERR): Galactic N_{H} and associated uncertainty from Evans et al. (2020) [cm^{-2}].	FGL_LP_EPEAK(_ERR): Peak energy of LogPar fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [MeV].
XRT_GAMMA(_ERR): Power law photon index and associated uncertainty from Evans et al. (2020) .	FGL_LP_SIGCURV: Significance of fit improvement between Power Law and LogParabola (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [σ].
XRT_(ABS, UNABS)_FLUX_n(_ERR): Unabsorbed and observed flux and associated uncertainty from Evans et al. (2020) [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].	FGL_PLEC_FLUXDEN(_ERR): Differential flux at pivot energy of the PLSuperExpCutoff fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [$\text{cm}^{-2} \text{MeV}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$].
OUSXB_RA, OUSXB_DEC: Equatorial coordinates of <i>Swift</i> -XRT sources from Giommi et al. (2019) [$^{\circ}$].	FGL_PLEC_INDEX(_ERR): Photon index at pivot energy for PLSuperExpCutoff fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).
OUSXB_(MIN, MAX, MEAN, MEDIAN)_FLUX_n: Minimum, maximum, median and mean sources flux from Giommi et al. (2019) [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].	FGL_PLEC_EXPFACTOR(_ERR): Spectral curvature at pivot energy for PLSuperExpCutoff fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).
OUSXB_N_FLUX_n: Number of observations of source in Giommi et al. (2019) with a flux.	FGL_PLEC_EXPINDEX(_ERR): Exponential index of PLSuperExpCutoff and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).
OUSXB_(MIN, MAX, MEAN, MEDIAN)_GAMMA: Minimum, maximum, median and mean power law photon index Giommi et al. (2019) .	FGL_PLEC_EPEAK(_ERR): Peak energy of PLSuperExpCutoff fit and associated uncertainty (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [MeV].
OUSXB_N_GAMMA: Number of observations of source in Giommi et al. (2019) with a power law photon index.	FGL_PLEC_SIGCURV: Significance of fit improvement between Power Law and PLSuperExpCutoff (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022) [σ].
NUSTAR_RA, NUSTAR_DEC: Equatorial coordinates of <i>NuSTAR</i> sources from Middei et al. (2022) [$^{\circ}$].	LAC_SED_CLASS: SED classes listed in the 4LAC catalog by Ajello et al. (2022) .
NUSTAR_GAMMA(_ERR): Photon index of <i>NuSTAR</i> sources from Middei et al. (2022) .	LAC_HE_EPEAK(_ERR): High-energy peak position listed in the 4LAC catalog by Ajello et al. (2022) and associated uncertainty [MeV].
NUSTAR_FLUX_n(_ERR): Flux of <i>NuSTAR</i> sources from Middei et al. (2022) [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].	LAC_HE_NUFNU(_ERR): High-energy peak flux listed in the 4LAC catalog by Ajello et al. (2022) [$\text{MeV cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].
BAT_SRC_NAME: Name of source given by Lien et al. (2025) .	LAC_LE_FREQ: Low-energy peak position listed in the 4LAC catalog by Ajello et al. (2022) [Hz].
BAT_RA, BAT_DEC: Equatorial coordinates of <i>Swift</i> -BAT sources from Lien et al. (2025) [$^{\circ}$].	LAC_nuFnu_syn: Low-energy peak flux listed in the 4LAC catalog by Ajello et al. (2022) [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].
BAT_TYPE: Source type provided by Lien et al. (2025) .	RFC_SRC_NAME: Name of source in RFC catalog (Petrov & Kovalev 2025).
BAT_(, MIN_, MAX_)FLUX_n: Flux, minimum and maximum flux of <i>Swift</i> -BAT sources from Lien et al. (2025) [$\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$].	RFC_YBAND_RES: Total Y-band flux density integrated over entire map (Petrov & Kovalev 2025) [Jy].
BAT_(, MIN_, MAX_)GAMMA: Photon index of <i>Swift</i> -BAT sources from Lien et al. (2025) .	RFC_YUPPER_RES: Blank for valid Y-band resolved total flux density, – for invalid and < for upper limits (Petrov & Kovalev 2025).
ASCAMASTER_EXPOTIME: <i>ASCA</i> exposure time according to Heasarc's ascamaster table [s].	
CHANMASTER_EXPOTIME: <i>Chandra</i> exposure time according to the chanmaster table [s].	
NUMASTER_EXPOTIME: <i>NuSTAR</i> exposure time according to the numaster table [s].	
SUZAMASTER_EXPOTIME: <i>Suzaku</i> exposure time according to the suzamaster table [s].	
XMMMASTER_EXPOTIME: <i>XMM-Newton</i> exposure time according to the xmmmaster table [s].	
SWIFTMASTR_EXPOTIME: <i>Swift</i> -XRT exposure time according to the swiftmastr table in [s].	
ROSMMASTER_EXPOTIME: <i>ROSAT</i> exposure time according to the rosmaster table in [s].	
FGL_COMMON_SRC_NAME: Name of identified or likely associated source from the 4FGL catalog (4FGL-DR4; Abdollahi et al. 2022).	

RFC_YBAND_UNRES: Unresolved *Y*-band flux density at long VLBA baselines (Petrov & Kovalev 2025) [Jy].

RFC_YUPPER_UNRES: Blank for valid *Y*-band unresolved flux density at VLBA baselines, – for invalid and < for upper limits (Petrov & Kovalev 2025).

TANAMI_SRC_NAME: Name within TANAMI program (Ojha et al. 2010; Müller et al. 2018).

TANAMI_CLASS: Class given by TANAMI (Ojha et al. 2010; Müller et al. 2018).

TANAMI_FLUX: Flux density at 8.4 GHz from TANAMI (Ojha et al. 2010; Müller et al. 2018) [Jy].

MOJAVE_SRC_NAME: Name of source in the MOJAVE program (Lister et al. 2021; Homan et al. 2021).

MOJAVE_CLASS: Class as listed by MOJAVE (Lister et al. 2021; Homan et al. 2021) (Q or B).

MOJAVE_FLUX: Flux density at 15 GHz from MOJAVE (Lister et al. 2021; Homan et al. 2021) [mJy].

N_MATCH: Number of potential counterparts (S25).

LS10_sep: Angular separation between BLAZE catalog and LS10 source [″].

LS10_use: 1 for agreement on the counterpart with S25, 0 otherwise.

LS10_RELEASE: LS10 release of counterpart (S25).

LS10_BRICKID: LS10 brick ID of counterpart (S25).

LS10_BRICKNAME: LS10 brick name of counterpart (S25).

LS10_OBJID: LS10 object ID of counterpart (S25).

LS10_RA(_IVAR), LS10_DEC(_IVAR): Position of LS10 counterpart (S25) [°, (°)⁻²].

LS10_Xray_proba: Probability of LS10 counterpart being an X-ray emitter (S25).

LS10_FULLID: LS10 catalog ID (S25).

ERO_LS10_ID: Combined *eROSITA* and LS10 catalog ID (S25).

Separation_LS10_ERO: Separation between LS10 counterpart and *eROSITA* position (S25) [″].

NCAT: Number of catalogs matched (S25).

DIST_BAYESFACTOR: Logarithm of ratio from prior and posterior distance matching (S25).

DIST_POST: Distance between posterior probability of a match compared to no matches (S25).

BIAS_LS10_XRAY_PROBA: Probability of counterpart being an X-ray emitter (S25).

P_SINGLE: Similar to DIST_POST including weighting by prior (S25).

P_ANY: Probability of any found match being correct (S25).

P_I: Match probability (S25).

MATCH_FLAG: Set to 1 for most probable match, 2 for other matches (S25).

TYPE: LS10 morphology model given by S25.

LS10_DCHISQ: Difference in χ^2 between successively more-complex model fits separated by _ (S25).

EBV: $E(B - V)$ at source position (S25) [mag].

FLUX(_IVAR)_X: LS10 band fluxes and associated inverse variance (S25) [nanomaggy, nanomaggy⁻²].

MW_TRANSMISSION_X: LS10 Galactic transmission at position of source (S25).

ANYMASK_X: Bitmask information if in any image of a band the central pixel satisfies the LS10 catalog criteria (S25).

ALLMASK_X: Bitmask information if in all image of a band the central pixel satisfies the LS10 catalog criteria (S25).

PSFSIZE_X: Size of FWHM of the LS10 PSF (S25) [″].

PSFDEPTH_X: LS10 5σ detection limit for a certain band (S25) [nanomaggy⁻²].

GALDEPTH_X: Same as PSFSIZE_X assuming a galaxy (S25) [nanomaggy⁻²].

WISEMASK_X: Bitmask information (S25).

W(1, 2, 3, 4)_MAG_AB: WISE magnitude in AB system calculated from FLUX_X using MW_TRANSMISSION_X [mag].

W(1, 2, 3, 4)_MAG: WISE magnitude in the Vega system calculated from FLUX_X using MW_TRANSMISSION_X [mag].

SHAPE_R(_IVAR): LS10 half-light radius for given TYPE (S25) [″, ″⁻²].

SHAPE_(E1, E2)(_IVAR): LS10 ellipticity component of galaxy (S25).

SERSIC(_IVAR): LS10 power law index of Sérsic profile and associated inverse variance (S25).

REF_CAT: LS10 reference catalog for stars (S25).

REF_ID: LS10 reference catalog id for star (S25).

REF_EPOCH: LS10 reference epoch of REF_CAT (S25) [a].

GAIA_PHOT_G_MEAN_MAG: LS10 Gaia G band magnitude (S25) [mag].

GAIA_PHOT_G_MEAN_FLUX_OVER_ERROR: LS10 Gaia G band signal-to-noise ratio (S25).

GAIA_PHOT_BP_MEAN_MAG: LS10 Gaia BP band magnitude (S25) [mag].

GAIA_PHOT_BP_MEAN_FLUX_OVER_ERROR: LS10 Gaia BP band signal-to-noise ratio (S25).

GAIA_PHOT_RP_MEAN_MAG: LS10 Gaia RP band magnitude (S25) [mag].

GAIA_PHOT_RP_MEAN_FLUX_OVER_ERROR: LS10 Gaia RP band signal-to-noise ratio (S25).

GAIA_ASTROMETRIC_EXCESS_NOISE: LS10 Gaia astrometric excess noise (S25).

GAIA_PHOT_BP_RP_EXCESS_FACTOR: LS10 Gaia BP/RP excess factor (S25).

GAIA_ASTROMETRIC_SIGMA5D_MAX: LS10 Gaia longest semi-major axis of the 5-d error ellipsoid (S25).

GAIA_DUPLICATED_SOURCE: LS10 Gaia duplicate source flag (S25).

INALLLS10: Nominal LS10 survey depth reached in all bands (S25).

INANYLS10: Nominal LS10 survey depth reached in one band (S25).

DERED_MAG_X: Dereddened magnitude (S25) [mag].

SOFTFLUX_S: *eROSITA* flux (S25) [erg cm⁻² s⁻¹].

SALVATO18_W1_X_LINEDISTANCE: Distance from separation line between Galactic and extra-galactic sources in the W1-X-ray plane (S25).

SALVATO22_ZW1_GR_LINEDISTANCE: Distance from separation line between Galactic and extra-galactic sources in the ZW1-GR plane (S25).

(G, Z, W1)_MINUS_(R, W1, W2): Color combinations (S25) [mag].

HAS_SALVATO18_AGN_COLORS: Information if source has colors consistent with being an AGN based on Salvato et al. (2018), from S25.

GAIA_MOVING_5SIGMA: Information if source shows movement at 5σ significance in Gaia (S25).

HAS_SALVATO22_AGN_COLORS: Information if source has colors consistent with being an AGN based on Salvato et al. (2022), from S25.

SALVATO_MAIN_ID_SIMBAD: SIMBAD ID (S25).

SALVATO_(RA, DEC)_SIMBAD: SIMBAD position (S25) [°].

EXGAL_PROB_STAREX: Probability of source being extra-galactic by STAREX with Gaia data (S25).

EXGAL_PROB_STAREX: Probability of source being extra-galactic by STAREX without Gaia data (S25).

CLASS_GAL_EXGAL: Galactic/extra-galactic class assigned by S25.	alpha_XG(_ERR): $\alpha_{\text{X}\Gamma}$ using PWL20_FLUX_UNABS_0 and FGL_FLUX_A and associated uncertainty.
SALVATO_HECATE: 1 for sources within HECATE source (S25) [°].	alpha_IRX(_ERR): α_{IRX} using PWL20_FLUX_UNABS_0 and FLUX_W1 combined with MW_TRANSMISSION_W1 and associated uncertainty, including a systematic uncertainty.
SALVATO_HEC_OBJNAME: Name of HECATE source (S25).	alpha_OX(_ERR): α_{OX} using PWL20_FLUX_UNABS_0 and FLUX_R combined with MW_TRANSMISSION_R and associated uncertainty, including a systematic uncertainty.
SALVATO_HEC_RA, SALVATO_HEC_DEC: Position of HECATE source (S25) [°].	alpha_RX(_ERR): α_{RX} using PWL20_FLUX_UNABS_0 and RFC_XBAND_RES and associated uncertainty.
SALVATO_HEC_R1: Semi major axis of HECATE source (S25) [″].	alpha_TANAMI(_ERR): α_{TANAMI} using PWL20_FLUX_UNABS_0 and TANAMI_FLUX and associated uncertainty.
SALVATO_HEC_R2: Semi minor axis of HECATE source (S25) [″].	alpha_MOJAVE(_ERR): α_{MOJAVE} using PWL20_FLUX_UNABS_0 and MOJAVE_FLUX and associated uncertainty.
SALVATO_HEC_PA: Position angle of HECATE source (S25) [°]. HECATE source (S25) [″].	SIMBAD_SRC_NAME: Name of closest source match on SIMBAD.
PURITY(6, 7, 8): Purity obtained for DET_LIKE_0 > (6, 7, 8) at source position (S25).	SIMBAD_TYPE: Type of source, if a blazar or AGN classification or a more precise type is listed as alternative, this one is selected.
COMPLETENESS(6, 7, 8): Completeness obtained for DET_LIKE_0 > (6, 7, 8) at source position (S25).	SIMBAD_ALT_TYPES: All alternate types as listed in SIMBAD.
COMPUR(6, 7, 8): Intersection between completeness and purity obtained for DET_LIKE_0 > (6, 7, 8) at source position (S25).	SIMBAD_TYPE2: Type of source as listed by SIMBAD.
THRESHOLD(6, 7, 8): P_ANY value at intersection obtained for DET_LIKE_0 > (6, 7, 8) at source position (S25).	SIMBAD_ANGSEP: Angular separation between BLAZE catalog source and SIMBAD source [°]
Z_PHOTO(_S3L, _S3U, _S1L, _S1U): 3σ and 1σ upper and lower value of photometric redshift (S25).	CAMBRIDGE_SRC_NAME: Name in Third Cambridge catalog of radio sources as listed in SIMBAD.
Z_SPEC: Spectroscopic redshift from Kluge et al. (2024) provided by S25.	PARKS_SRC_NAME: Name in Parkes catalog of radio sources as listed in SIMBAD.
SPEC_REF: Source with Z_SPEC from Kluge et al. (2024) provided by S25 [°].	TEXAS_SRC_NAME: Name in Texas survey of radio sources as listed in SIMBAD.
Z_ABC: Redshift listed in the ABC catalog (Paggi et al. 2020).	EINSTEIN_SRC_NAME: Name in Einstein 2E catalog of IPC X-Ray sources as listed in SIMBAD.
Z_HSP: Redshift listed in the 3HSP catalog (Chang et al. 2019).	COMMON_SRC_NAME: Most commonly used source name from the above as listed in SIMBAD.
Z_F_HSP: Redshift flag listed in the 3HSP catalog (Chang et al. 2019).	BZCAT_RMAG: R-band magnitude from the BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015) [mag].
Z_MILLIQUAS: Redshift listed in the Milliquas catalog (Flesch 2023).	BZCAT_FR: Radio flux density at 1.4 GHz or if unknown at 0.843 GHz from the BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015) [mJy].
Z_HIGHZ: Redshift listed in the HighZ sample.	BZCAT_F143: Flux density at 143 GHz from the Planck Compact Source Catalog Public Release 1 from the BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015) [mJy].
Z_HIGHZ_REF: Paper reference for high-redshift sources.	BZCAT_FLUX_U: X-ray flux in the 0.1–2.4 keV band from the BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015) [fWm ⁻²].
Z_MOJAVE: Redshift listed in MOJAVE.	BZCAT_FLUX_B: γ -ray flux in the 1–100 GeV band from the BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015) [photons cm ⁻² s ⁻¹].
Z_4LAC: Redshift listed in the 4LAC catalog (Ajello et al. 2022).	BZCAT_ALPHA_RO: The radio-to-optical spectral index of the blazar from the BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015).
Z_BZCAT: Redshift listed from the BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015).	XIE_MORPH_BZCAT: Radio morphology for BZCAT sources as listed in Xie et al. (2024).
Z_U_BZCAT: Redshift flag from the BZCAT catalog (Massaro et al. 2015).	XIE_MORPH_KDEBLACS: Radio morphology for KDEBLACS sources as listed in Xie et al. (2024).
Z_CGRABS: Redshift listed in the CGRaBS catalog (Healey et al. 2008).	XIE_MORPH_WIBRALS: Radio morphology for WIBRALS sources as listed in Xie et al. (2024).
Z_F_CGRABS: Redshift flag listed in CGRaBS catalog (Healey et al. 2008).	
Z_VERONCAT: Redshift listed in the VERONCAT catalog (Véron-Cetty & Véron 2010).	
Z_VERONCAT_QSO: Redshift listed in the VERONCAT QSO catalog (Véron-Cetty & Véron 2010).	
Z_SIMBAD: Redshift listed on SIMBAD.	
Z_MASTER: Reliable redshift adopted for population studies (for selection see Sect. 4.4).	
Z_MASTER_REF: Source of Z_MASTER.	
Z_MASTER_PHOTO: Reliable redshift including the photometric ones from S25.	
Z_MASTER_PHOTO_REF: Source where Z_MASTER_PHOTO was taken from.	
XRAY_LUM_n(_ERR): X-ray luminosity calculated from the fixed $\Gamma_{\text{X}} = 2.0$ fit and Z_MASTER [erg s ⁻¹].	
XRAY_LUM_PHOTO_n(_ERR): X-ray luminosity calculated from the fixed $\Gamma_{\text{X}} = 2.0$ fit and Z_MASTER_PHOTO [erg s ⁻¹].	