









Reconstruction of energetic electron precipitation for the last 130 years

Timo Asikainen, Miro Ruopsa, Lauri Holappa, Kalevi Mursula University of Oulu <u>timo.asikainen@oulu.fi</u>



Contents



- What makes the reconstruction possible?
 Corrected NOAA/MEPED data
- Long-term geomagnetic indices used
- Reconstruction model
- Results



NOAA/POES particle measurements



 The particle dataset has been plagued by significant problems related to the MEPED instrument and data quality.



LE: 🌺 🖊



- Estimating the detector aging effects (radiation damage, noise effects) [Asikainen and Mursula, 2011; Asikainen et al. 2012]
- Cross-contamination (electron instrument also measures protons and vice versa) [Asikainen and Mursula, 2013]
- Non-ideal instrument effciencies (estimated by detector simulations) [Asikainen and Mursula, 2013]
- Effects of differences in instrument design in different satellites [Asikainen and Mursula, 2013]
- Recomputed satellite positions and dependent data (magnetic fields, L-values, MLT etc.)



- Average of 0° (radial) and 90° (horizontal) telescope fluxes
 - Better represents the precipitating flux than the 0° telescope, which only measures a small portion of the total precipitation
- Fluxes from dawn/dusk on Northern hemisphere L>2
- Electron fluxes at 3 different energy ranges
 - > 30 keV (ring current electrons)
 - > 100 keV (ring current electrons)
 - > 300 keV (radiation belt electrons)







NOAA/MEPED data used here

 90° telescope before 1998 (SEM-1 era) pointed in a different direction than after 1998 (SEM-2 era)



- → Systematic difference in pre-1998 and post-1998
- This will be taken into account in the analysis



Overview of electron precipitation

- We have direct measurements over three solar cycles.
- Fluxes peak in the declining phase



🔣 🛞 🗛



Overview of electron precipitation

- Recent results show that highspeed streams are the most significant driver of electron precpiptation
- Asikainen and Ruopsa (2016), JGR





- aa index is derived from K-indices of two antipodal stations:
 - Hartland, UK (previously Greenwich and Abinger)
 - Melbourne, Toolangi, Canberra (Australia)
- Describes range of geomagnetic variation in 3h time intervals
- Responds to shortterm variations like substorms
- aa index is available from 1868 to present





Geomagnetic indices: aa index

- Geomagnetic aa index has been shown to be inhomogeneous due to a station change from Abinger to Hartland in 1957 (e.g., Lockwood et al., 2014).
- We calibrated aa by comparing to Ap index.
- We found that aa inhomogeneity is corrected by dividing the data after 1957 by 1.2168/1.0741=1.13. The corrected aa index is denoted as aa_c.





- IDV(1d) is a daily index and is defined as the absolute difference in the daily averaged horizontal magnetic field component of two consecutive days (Lockwood et al., 2013)
- → Responds to slow variations with a time scale of several days, i.e., magnetic storms



- IDV(1d) index used here is based on data from
 - Parc St. Maur (1883-1901)
 - Val-Joyeux (1901-1936)
 - Chambon la Foret (1936-2014)
 - All these stations are at closeby locations in France.





- Spatial (latitudinal) distribution of geomagnetic activity is different in CME and HSS driven disturbances
- Lots of CMEs → red distribution
- Lots of HSSs → blue distribution
- These are nearly mirror images of each other!





Principal components

- The degree to which the latitudinal distribution resembles that of CMEs or HSSs can be obtained by Principal Component Analysis
- → 2nd PC of local geomagnetic activity is a rough measure for HSS fraction (Holappa et al., 2014a, 2014b)





Principal components

🥂 🛞 🗛







- We used the following equation to model the monthly average electron fluxes: $\log(F) = a(PC_2) + b(PC_2) \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{aa_c}} + c(PC_2) \times \frac{1}{IDV(1d)}$
- Regression coefficients are assumed to be functions of PC₂
- Assumed AR(1) noise in error estimates
- Iteratively found an optimal coefficient to calibrate the difference between SEM-1 and SEM-2 satellites requiring maximum R² in the model







- Notice that when PC2 is large (dominant HSS driving) a particular value of IDV(1d) corresponds to a larger flux
- → In declining phases PC2 gives an extra contribution to the flux on top of the part described by aa index.





• Monthly fluxes are extremely well modeled!

Model performance for log-fluxes (all correlations highly significant, p<10 ⁻¹¹)	E>30 keV	E>100 keV	E>300 keV
Monthly values (correlation R, R^2 , mean relative error Δ)	R=0.9598	R=0.9545	R=0.8891
	R ² =0.9211	R ² =0.9110	R ² =0.7904
	∆=1.2%	∆=1.9%	∆=4%
Annual averages	R=0.9746	R=0.9801	R=0.9259
(correlation R, R ² ,	R ² =0.9499	R ² =0.9607	R ² =0.8572
mean relative error, Δ)	∆=0.8%	∆=1.0%	∆=2.4%





Model follows data pretty well







- Regression model gives us a reconstruction of electron fluxes from 1883 to present.
- In each solar cycle the fluxes peak in the declining phase!









 Uncertainties grow larger with energy → Geomagnetic indices explain the lower energies better





- Different energy channels show slightly different long-term changes
- Spectral index (i.e., steepness of energy spectrum) shows solar cycle variation and centennial variation
- In beginning of 20th and 21th centuries the spectrum was softer than in the middle of 20th century
- → Implications for atmospheric ionization, chemistry, climate effects?







- Corrected MEPED data from NOAA/POES satellites allows us to study energetic electron precipitation directly for over 3 solar cycles
- ► → Enough data to build a statististical model
- We built a model based on aa, IDV(1d) and their 2nd principal component
- aa index can reproduce majority of electron flux variation
- However, the declining phases are not well represented by aa alone → Underestimates flux!
- Resulting centennial estimate can be used, e.g., to estimate atmospheric ionozation and climate effects on centennial time scales