

Table 2. Photometric results.

Src	$m_{\text{F555W}}$	$m_{\text{F814W}}$	$m_{\text{F110M}}$	$m_{\text{F110W}}$	$m_{\text{F113N}}$	$m_{\text{F145M}}$	$m_{\text{F164N}}$	$m_{\text{F204M}}$	$m_{\text{F205W}}$	$m_{\text{F212N}}$	$r$
1 <sup>a</sup>	$20.07 \pm 0.01$	$21.31 \pm 0.01$	$20.80 \pm 0.01$	$20.49 \pm 0.26$	$20.25 \pm 0.03$	$18.53 \pm 0.12$	$19.95 \pm 0.08$	$17.30 \pm 0.01$	$19.34 \pm 0.02$	$19.63 \pm 0.34$	17
2 <sup>b</sup>	$> 24.71$	$25.41 \pm 0.18$	$22.51 \pm 0.01$	$21.72 \pm 0.44$	$21.21 \pm 0.06$	$20.90 \pm 0.55$	$21.03 \pm 0.12$	$20.41 \pm 0.11$	$20.28 \pm 0.03$	$19.63 \pm 0.25$	19
3 <sup>b</sup>	$> 24.86$	$26.46 \pm 0.46$	$23.43 \pm 0.03$	$22.26 \pm 0.57$	$22.49 \pm 0.21$	$> 21.13$	$21.76 \pm 0.21$	$21.30 \pm 0.19$	$21.20 \pm 0.07$	$> 20.27$	20
4 <sup>b</sup>	$> 24.79$	$25.35 \pm 0.17$	$24.03 \pm 0.04$	$22.16 \pm 0.51$	$23.00 \pm 0.36$	... <sup>f</sup>	$22.32 \pm 0.30$	$21.46 \pm 0.33$	$21.98 \pm 0.16$	$> 20.05$	
5 <sup>c</sup>	$25.73 \pm 0.36$	$26.38 \pm 0.16$	$24.79 \pm 0.03$	$> 22.54$	$24.01 \pm 0.29$	$21.88 \pm 0.45$	$23.29 \pm 0.35$	$22.61 \pm 0.29$	$22.71 \pm 0.11$	$> 21.36$	
5 <sup>d</sup>	$> 25.59$	$27.09 \pm 0.43$	$26.28 \pm 0.18$	$> 22.24$	$> 23.97$	$> 21.52$	$> 22.84$	$> 22.33$	$> 23.50$	$> 21.20$	
5 <sup>e</sup>	$26.36 \pm 0.90$	$27.64 \pm 0.44$	$26.15 \pm 0.13$	$22.95 \pm 0.71$	$> 23.75$	$> 22.61$	$23.17 \pm 0.49$	$> 22.38$	$23.64 \pm 0.53$	$> 20.77$	

<sup>a</sup>In a partial annulus about source 2, with  $0''.7 < r < 1''.6$  and  $135^\circ < \text{PA} < 225^\circ$ .

<sup>b</sup>In a  $1''.0$  diameter aperture.

<sup>c</sup>In a  $0''.38$  diameter aperture.

<sup>d</sup>In a  $0''.38$  diameter aperture, after subtracting the flux from an identically-sized region on the opposite side of component 2.

<sup>e</sup>Estimated total flux of counterimage (see §4.3).

<sup>f</sup>Strongly affected by residual latency effects not fully removed by the reduction process.