

**Solar wind – Variability, evolution to Earth  
and influence  
on the terrestrial magnetic field**

Doctoral thesis in physics

*Malte S. Venzmer*

University of Göttingen

Institute for Astrophysics

January 2012 – Dez? 2017

Supervisor:  
Dr. Volker Bothmer

Referees:  
Prof. Dr. Ansgar Reiners  
Prof. ??

---

*“Despite the ‘Dr.’ before his name, he had completed no course of study and received no degree. When people tried to pin him down about this, he would say that the letters were merely an abbreviation of his first name - Drummond - which he did not use. But it was as ‘Dr.’ Sam Laserowitz that he appeared in a number of science-fiction magazines; he was also known, in the circles of the fans of that genre, as a lecturer, and spoke on ‘cosmic’ themes at their many conferences and convention. Laserowitz’s speciality was earthshaking discoveries, which he happened upon two or three times a year. [...] We really have no idea what a multitude of con men and crackpots inhabit the domain that lies halfway between contemporary science and the insane asylum.”*

Excerpt from Stanisław Lem 1968, *His Master’s Voice* (Lem & Kandel 1984, p. 38).

version log:

- 1 2013-11-06
- 2 2013-11-07 inserted lem excerpt
- 3 2014-09-01 outlined introduction structure and appendix key words
- 4 2014-09-11 bibtex included, lem excerpt citet
- 5 2014-09-12 included italic titles in bibliography
- 6 2015-01-12 worked on introduction structure and included magnetic butterfly diagram
- 7 2015-05-04 first printout, small additions
- 8 2015-07-03 coupling functions, content structure
- 9 2015-09-09 Alfvén wave velocity formula
- 10 2015-09-10 Appendix physics: Alfvén and compressional MHD waves, plasma beta; citation sources Cranmer2005, Kivelson1995
- 11 2015-09-15 CGAUSS work overview; DQCS model figure
- 12 2015-09-16 magnetic energy density is the same as magnetic pressure, abbreviations
- 13 2015-09-30 empirical solar-wind model plots in analyses, figure label [Figure 4.2 Text]
- 14 2015-10-02 table column decimal alignment; set caption width
- 15 2015-10-05 table units; radial parameter (N, T) profiles in literature
- 16 2015-10-06 literature radial electron density models; log-normal distribution
- 17 2015-10-07 log-normal formulae
- 18 2015-10-08 log-normal fit
- 19 2015-10-09 shape fit parameter table; radial variance fitting
- 20 2015-10-14 variance fit values; log-normal citation Bronstein
- 21 2015-10-19 radial distribution width fitting; clarifying of solar-wind model formulae structure and naming variables
- 22 2015-10-20 log-normal distribution width factor changes the shape!
- 23 2015-10-23 log-normal distributions mu and sigma plot
- 24 2015-10-30 new sigmafit2 figures implemented; formulae adaption
- 25 2015-11-02 reason for use of log-normal function
- 26 2015-11-20 single log-normal shape fit; not chisquare - SSR;  $R^2$  in appendix
- 27 2015-11-26 reduced SSR into tables; table column aligning
- 28 2015-12-02 smoothing SSR integration
- 29 2015-12-07 integrating structure remarks from printout
- 30 2015-12-09 splitting analyses chapter into two; browsing folders for usable things for thesis
- 31 2015-12-10 integrating citations and references
- 32 2015-12-16 integrating citations and references
- 33 2015-12-18 solar-wind structures list of Richardson

- 
- 34 2016-02-02 sws distributions
  - 35 2016-02-11 basics structure
  - 36 2016-02-12 analyses questions
  - 37 2016-02-15 analyses structure; in situ, near-Sun
  - 38 2016-02-16 Kp index internal resolution
  - 39 2016-02-17 Bartels1962; non-breaking hyphen shorthand implemented
  - 40 2016-02-18 analysesI structure
  - 41 2016-02-25 abstract
  - 42 2016-02-26 english comma
  - 43 2016-03-01 Bartels Kp origin paper, bibtex reference
  - 44 2016-03-02 abstract
  - 45 2016-03-03 Planck paper
  - 46 2016-03-07 formation of stars
  - 47 2016-03-08 formation of stars
  - 48 2016-03-16 solar interior structure
  - 49 2016-03-17 solar interior structure
  - 50 2016-03-18 solar surface
  - 51 2016-03-22 Astronomical Almanac citation
  - 52 2016-03-23 solar core definition
  - 53 2016-03-26 sunspots
  - 54 2016-03-29 Sun interior figure
  - 55 2016-03-30 solar composition
  - 56 2016-03-31 Sun interior figure finished; chromosphere
  - 57 2016-04-01 Sun atmosphere figure finished
  - 58 2016-04-03 chromosphere, corona, CV
  - 59 2016-04-07 CV
  - 60 2016-04-08 CV; heliosphere
  - 61 2016-04-09 corona; heliosphere
  - 62 2016-04-11 heliosheath magnetic bubbles; Opher2011
  - 63 2016-04-12 heliosphere; voyagers; Gurnett2013
  - 64 2016-04-13 solar-wind effects, solar rotation
  - 65 2016-04-14 analysesI sws structure draft plots
  - 66 2016-04-15 analysesI concept work
  - 67 2016-04-19 incorporate annotations from processed printout
  - 68 2016-04-21 incorporate annotations from processed printout II
  - 69 2016-04-22 incorporate annotations from processed printout III
  - 69 2016-04-23 updated .bst file (for displaying arXiv id); implemented optional url displaying for electronic version; Kp year variations
  - 70 2016-04-24 Kp frequency by month statistics and plot; Sun and Earth tilt plot
  - 71 2016-04-25 solar cycle extrema dates literature
  - 72 2016-04-27 Kp semi annual variation, Rangarajan1997
  - 73 2016-05-01 Kp frequency by year
  - 74 2016-05-04 Kp + SSN plot; ACE data errors/gaps; log-normal plot; differential rotation plot
  - 75 2016-05-05 aggregate correlation coefficient tables, CME fraction plot
  - 76 2016-05-06 overall sws fractions
  - 77 2016-05-17 figure sw frequencies by year; restructured solar-wind distributions section; formal cover page
  - 78 2016-05-20 Earth-Sun distance; JPL web interface
  - 79 2016-05-31 GSM system
  - 80 2016-06-10 Offline Anmerkungen einarbeiten
  - 81 2016-06-12 LaTeX Earth symbol package
  - 82 2016-06-13 numbers=noenddot
  - 83 2016-06-14 references removed comma before ampersand; offline Anmerkungen einarbeiten; thesis\_raw version
  - 84 2016-06-17 gnuplot figures and latex; latex document style options
  - 85 2016-06-19 header implemented
  - 86 2016-06-20 minor things; introduction
  - 87 2016-06-23 solar tilt axis
  - 88 2016-06-24 solar rotation
  - 89 2016-07-12 magnetosphere temp figure; analyses: solar-wind model
  - 90 2016-07-13 lognormal spelling

---

91 2016-07-14 constant mass flow rate  
92 2016-07-18 line-up periods  
93 2016-07-19 line-up periods table  
94 2016-07-20 redone line-up analysis  
95 2016-07-21 line-up tables  
96 2016-07-22 line-up fit function plots; coefficient table  
97 2016-07-22 line-up sw types and period plots; overview plot  
98 2016-07-24 line-up averaging and justification  
99 2016-07-29 line-up rework  
100 2016-07-30 line-up structure  
101 2016-07-31 line-up table  
102 2016-08-02 line-up structure  
103 2016-08-03 line-up fits and table  
104 2016-08-04 insert offline comments  
105 2016-08-15 literature radial sw functions  
106 2016-08-18 work offline comments in  
107 2016-08-19 work offline comments in  
108 2016-08-28 analyses II rework structure  
109 2016-08-31 analyses II rework structure  
110 2016-09-01 analyses II rework figures  
111 2016-09-02 analyses II rework structure  
112 2016-09-03 Helios latitude dependency  
113 2016-09-04 extrapolation model fit parameter table; Helios latitude dependence  
114 2016-09-06 work in offline comments  
115 2016-09-14 implement median and mean in composite fit table; create kile project for thesis; url and raw fork  
116 2016-09-17 Ulysses polar plot; solar distance plots  
117 2016-09-18 for solar distance and latitude -> 4-panel figures created and implemented; appendix figures  
118 2016-09-20 latitude plots updated  
119 2016-09-26 single lognormal fit figure  
120 2016-09-27 minor tweaks in analyses II  
121 2016-09-29 simple fit table errors; table style  
122 2016-10-05 lognormal fit errors for tables  
123 2016-10-10 line-up passing remarks from AP  
124 2016-10-12 siunitx package incorporated  
125 2017-01-04 package fancyhdr replaced with scrlayer-scrpage; offline comments for Basics + Data incorporated  
126 2017-01-06 package floatrow included for figure side captions; some cites; magnetometer  
127 2017-01-08 sun figure updates and new ion energy spectrum figure incorporated  
128 2017-01-13 offline comments, new chapter order  
129 2017-01-18 activated hyperref package; included autoref and eqref; adjusted link colors; header links  
130 2017-02-02 offline comments  
131 2017-02-03 offline comments II, eclipse image  
132 2017-02-06 basics figures with floatrow; flow structure  
133 2017-02-07 ion energy spectrum figure  
134 2017-02-09 Helios mission ssn plot  
135 2017-02-12 offline comments  
136 2017-02-13 section number link to toc; offline comments  
137 2017-02-14 eclipse and magbfly figure captions  
138 2017-02-16 offline comments  
139 2017-02-19 coronal heating and sw acceleration  
140 2017-04-22 set up git repository  
141 2017-04-23 incorporate offline comments  
142 2017-04-26 bipolar region draft  
143 2017-04-27 magnetic layer Ossendrijver2003  
144 2017-06-29 magnetosphere figure drafts implemented  
145 2017-07-16 streamlined content - including paper and chapter2  
146 2017-07-22 streamlined duplicate content  
147 2017-10-05 Kp index data  
148 2017-10-28 geomagnetic indices; Kp index; Kp to ap table

---

149 2017-10-29 Kp index  
150 2017-10-30 OMNI s/c coverage figure  
151 2017-10-31 OMNI s/c coverage figure upgrade; data set timeline figure  
152 2017-11-01 SSN prediction; omega-effect  
153 2017-11-02 alpha-omega dynamo; magnetogram figure upgrade  
154 2017-11-03 worked on figure permissions; alpha-omega-figure  
155 2017-11-04 paperMVVB inserted; worked on compatibility  
156 2017-11-12 paperMVVB: figure size, tablefoot, adjusted table width; included chapter2; ordered file implementing  
157 2017-11-14 figure permission Babaszkiewicz1998  
158 2017-11-15 poking around in image credits; solar activity cycle  
159 2017-11-16 solar activity cycle; Zhao image permission  
160 2017-11-17 Zhao copyright symbol included; solar-wind; commata and sentence wording  
161 2017-11-22 notes from github paper folder  
162 2017-11-23 Ulysses figure permission and caption; pdfpages package; paper included as is  
163 2017-11-24 GUM reference; Helios data frequency figure  
164 2017-11-25 intro to paper

2017-11-25 14:23 – last save



## **Abstract**

This thesis analyzes the solar-wind variability, its properties, how they evolve on their way from the Sun and how strong the solar wind's internal structures impact the terrestrial magnetosphere. In situ data from the near-Earth OMNI data set and sunspot number data is used for deriving a functional dependence of the solar-wind parameters with the state of the solar cycle. Data from the Helios missions is analyzed and empirical solar-wind distance dependencies for 0.3–1.0 au are derived. In view of the planned near-Sun spacecraft mission Solar Probe Plus, additionally the solar-wind environment is estimated down to < 10 solar radii. In situ solar-wind measurements from the near-Earth OMNI data set are analyzed together with time series of the planetary geomagnetic disturbance indicator  $K_p$ . Correlation functions are compiled with regard to forecast the magnitude of the geomagnetic disturbances from solar-wind measurements.

# Contents

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Basics</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| 2.1      | Solar composition . . . . .   | 3         |
| 2.2      | Solar dynamics . . . . .  | 5         |
| 2.3      | Solar activity cycle . . . . .                                      | 6         |
| 2.4      | Heliospheric magnetic field . . . . .                               | 8         |
| 2.5      | Solar wind . . . . .  | 10        |
| 2.6      | Heliospheric magnetic field . . . . .                               | 10        |
| 2.7      | Solar wind properties and structures . . . . .                      | 11        |
| 2.7.1    | Solar wind plasma . . . . .   | 11        |
| 2.7.2    | Slow solar wind . . . . .   | 11        |
| 2.7.3    | High speed streams . . . . .  | 12        |
| 2.7.4    | Stream interaction regions . . . . .                                | 12        |
| 2.7.5    | HCS / HPS . . . . .   | 12        |
| 2.7.6    | Coronal mass ejections . . . . .                                    | 12        |
| 2.8      | Space weather . . . . .   | 13        |
| 2.8.1    | Solar influence on Earth . . . . .                                  | 13        |
| 2.8.2    | Magnetosphere . . . . .   | 14        |
| 2.8.3    | Geomagnetic indices . . . . .                                       | 15        |
| 2.8.4    | Solar wind–magnetosphere coupling . . . . .                         | 15        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Data</b>   | <b>17</b> |
| 3.1      | Instruments . . . . .   | 17        |
| 3.1.1    | Magnetometer . . . . .  | 17        |
| 3.1.2    | Plasma detector . . . . .   | 17        |
| 3.2      | Data sources . . . . .  | 18        |
| 3.2.1    | Sunspot number . . . . .  | 18        |
| 3.2.2    | <i>Kp</i> index . . . . .   | 19        |
| 3.2.3    | OMNI data set . . . . .   | 20        |
| 3.2.4    | Helios probes . . . . .   | 21        |
| 3.2.5    | Parker Solar Probe . . . . .  | 23        |
| 3.2.6    | Real-time solar-wind data . . . . .                                 | 23        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Chapter2 – Solar wind and CME influence on the magnetosphere</b> | <b>25</b> |
| 4.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 25        |
| 4.2      | Long-term variations of the <i>Kp</i> index . . . . .               | 26        |
| 4.2.1    | <i>Kp</i> data . . . . .  | 26        |
| 4.2.2    | <i>Kp</i> variations with solar activity . . . . .                  | 26        |
| 4.2.3    | Seasonal <i>Kp</i> variations . . . . .                             | 28        |
| 4.3      | <i>Kp</i> nowcast from in situ solar wind measurements . . . . .    | 29        |
| 4.3.1    | Solar wind-magnetosphere coupling . . . . .                         | 29        |
| 4.3.2    | Data set, data processing and correlation . . . . .                 | 30        |
| 4.3.3    | Functional dependency . . . . .                                     | 31        |
| 4.4      | <i>Kp</i> forecast from remote CME observations . . . . .           | 32        |
| 4.4.1    | CME velocity estimation . . . . .                                   | 33        |
| 4.4.2    | SWS CME list . . . . .  | 33        |
| 4.4.3    | Data processing and correlation . . . . .                           | 33        |
| 4.4.4    | Functional dependency for CMEs . . . . .                            | 34        |
| 4.4.5    | Functional dependency for non-CMEs . . . . .                        | 34        |
| 4.5      | Results and discussion . . . . .                                    | 36        |
| 4.6      | Conclusions . . . . .   | 37        |
| 4.7      | Outlook . . . . .   | 37        |

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 4.8 Acknowledgments . . . . .   | 37        |
| <b>5 chapter2</b>   | <b>39</b> |
| 5.1 Solar wind interaction processes with the magnetosphere . . . . .             | 39        |
| 5.2 Solar wind–magnetosphere coupling functions . . . . .                         | 39        |
| 5.3 Parameter selection . . . . .   | 40        |
| 5.4 Data selection . . . . .  | 40        |
| 5.5 Solar cycle influence . . . . .   | 40        |
| 5.6 CME correlations . . . . .  | 40        |
| 5.7 Solar wind structure analyses . . . . .                                       | 40        |
| 5.8 Forecast . . . . .  | 41        |
| <b>6 PaperMVVB</b>  | <b>43</b> |
| 6.1 Literature . . . . .  | 43        |
| 6.2 Seasonal solar wind variations . . . . .                                      | 43        |
| 6.3 Latitude dependency . . . . .   | 44        |
| 6.4 Radial evolution of solar wind structures . . . . .                           | 45        |
| 6.5 Solar distance dependency—theory . . . . .                                    | 45        |
| 6.5.1 change B-field radial dependency... . . . . .                               | 46        |
| 6.6 flux conservation . . . . .   | 46        |
| 6.7 sw parameters and precision . . . . .   | 47        |
| 6.8 other . . . . .   | 48        |
| 6.9 Paper... . . . .  | 49        |
| <b>7 Paper: Solar-wind predictions for the Parker Solar Probe orbit</b>           | <b>50</b> |
| Abstract . . . . .  | 50        |
| 7.1 Introduction . . . . .  | 50        |
| 7.2 Frequency distributions of the solar-wind parameters . . . . .                | 52        |
| 7.3 Solar activity dependence of the solar-wind frequency distributions . . . . . | 53        |
| 7.4 Solar distance dependency . . . . .   | 56        |
| 7.5 Empirical solar-wind model . . . . .  | 59        |
| 7.6 Model extrapolation to PSP orbit . . . . .                                    | 60        |
| 7.7 Discussion and summary . . . . .  | 62        |
| References . . . . .  | 63        |
| <b>8 Helios radial line-up passings</b>   | <b>65</b> |
| <b>9 Results+conclusions</b>  | <b>71</b> |
| <b>10 Summary and outlook</b>   | <b>73</b> |
| <b>A Physics</b>  | <b>75</b> |
| A.1 Electromagnetism . . . . .  | 75        |
| A.2 Solar wind pressures . . . . .  | 75        |
| A.3 Plasma beta . . . . .   | 75        |
| A.4 Alfvén waves . . . . .  | 76        |
| A.5 Solar surface differential rotation . . . . .                                 | 76        |
| A.6 Earth orbit geometry . . . . .  | 77        |
| A.6.1 Solar distance . . . . .  | 78        |
| A.6.2 Solar rotation axis tilt . . . . .  | 78        |
| A.6.3 Earth tilt . . . . .  | 78        |
| A.7 Coordinate systems . . . . .  | 78        |
| A.7.1 Geocentric Solar Ecliptic . . . . .   | 79        |
| A.7.2 Geocentric Solar Magnetospheric . . . . .                                   | 79        |
| A.7.3 Heliographic Inertial . . . . .   | 79        |
| <b>B Math</b>   | <b>81</b> |
| B.1 Correlations . . . . .  | 81        |
| B.2 Lognormal distribution . . . . .  | 81        |
| B.3 Goodness of fit . . . . .   | 82        |

## Contents

---

|                                      |           |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| B.4 other . . . . .                  | 83        |
| <b>C Glossary</b>                    | <b>85</b> |
| C.1 Astronomical constants . . . . . | 85        |
| C.2 Symbols . . . . .                | 85        |
| C.3 Abbreviations . . . . .          | 85        |
| <b>References</b>                    | <b>87</b> |
| Acknowledgments                      | 91        |
| Curriculum vitae                     | 93        |

# 1 Introduction

Introductory text -> motivation

- time variation analysis
- distance analysis
- $K_p$  impact analysis

(Kurzer Text zur Motivation für diese Arbeit, wie es zum Thema kam und wie das Ziel erreicht wurde)

scientific goals

- finding more precise connections/relationships between parameters/quantities -> for being able to make better forecasts

Synopsis (chapters, content)

This thesis merges the solar-wind analyses of its variation in time (autorefch:), its evolution to Earth (chapter XX) and its impact on the magnetosphere (chapter XX). The solar-wind model derived in the first two chapters is used together with SSN predictions to estimate the near-Sun solar-wind environment the planned SPP spacecraft will encounter during its mission, beginning in 2018. Lists of constants, symbols and abbreviations used in this thesis are located in the appendix.



## 2 Basics

First this chapter sketches the Sun's origin, inner structure, atmosphere and heliosphere. Then the Sun's dynamics with its magnetic field variations and solar cycle are outlined (including differential rotation, magnetic field generation, solar cycle, quiet/active Sun characteristics on surface and solar wind with HMF consequences). The solar wind and its characteristic structures are described. Further, the solar influence on Earth, on its magnetosphere and other space weather effects are portrayed.

### 2.1 Solar composition

13.8 billion years ago the Big Bang formed our universe. The energy density of our universe consists of 69.1 % dark energy, 25.9 % dark matter and 4.9 % baryonic matter, according to calculations using the inflationary  $\Lambda$ CDM cosmology together with the latest CMB temperature measurements ([Planck Collaboration et al. 2016](#)). After a few minutes the primordial nucleosynthesis left the universe in a state where the baryonic matter was composed of 75.33 %<sup>1</sup> hydrogen, 24.67 % helium and traces of deuterium, tritium and lithium ([Planck Collaboration et al. 2016](#)).

Over the years this gas cooled down and gravitationally accreted into molecular clouds and formed stars. The first generations of stars (Population III) fused this gas to heavier elements (metals) and supernovae distributed them into space as a foundation for the formation of new stars of low and high metallicity (Population II and I). Likewise, supernovae of these stars constantly enriched the interstellar medium with metals. Now, the interstellar medium in the Milky Way consists of about 32 % helium and traces of other metals ([Danziger 1970](#)).

Our Sun, a metal-rich Population I yellow dwarf star, emerged 4.6 billion years ago ([Bahcall et al. 1995](#)) from an accretion disk, formed by a collapsing rotating cloud. The compression within its center resulted in high temperatures, which initiated the fusion of hydrogen to helium (primarily pp chain reaction). The fusion reactions produce huge amounts of energy and heat the solar center to a temperature of 15.7 million kelvins ([Christensen-Dalsgaard et al. 1996](#)). The generated energy is transported through the solar body to its surface and eventually into space. The core region extends to about 0.25 solar radii ( $R_\odot$ ), where the declining temperature becomes insufficient for fusion reactions. The energy transport is dominated by thermal radiation until, because of declining ionization and density, at  $0.71 R_\odot$  up to the surface convective motion takes over ([Christensen-Dalsgaard et al. 1991](#)).


The temperature at this transition region (tachocline) is about 2 million kelvins and decreases up to the solar surface to between 4400–6600 K (cite?). Here at the photosphere, the energy is radiated away with an effective black body temperature of 5772 K ([Mamajek et al. 2015](#)), classifying the Sun as a spectral type G2V star. At this surface layer granules, the tops of convection cells, and temporary sunspots are visible. Strong magnetic flux inhibits the convection at sunspots, leading to lower temperature and brightness (for more details on sunspots see the next [section 2.2](#)). [Figure 2.1](#) illustrates these photospheric features along with the inner solar structure.

Above the photosphere at the base of the chromosphere, the temperature declines to its solar minimum of 3800 K until it raises to 2–3 million kelvins in the corona ([Billings 1959; Liebenberg et al. 1975](#)). Up to now it is not fully understood why the corona is so much hotter than the underlying chromosphere – this question is known as the coronal heating problem. The energy transfer mechanisms of choice are magnetic reconnections, wave heating and type II spicules or a combination of these (cite?).

The chromosphere is a 2000 km thick region whose features (numerous spicules, filaments and prominences) can reach far into the corona. They consist of chromospheric material channeled by the solar magnetic field, which is enveloped by a thin transition region where the temperature jumps up from ?20 000–35 000 K to coronal temperatures (cite?). Reconnection of magnetic field lines can result in the eruption of filaments into the corona and beyond, termed coronal mass ejections (CMEs) (see also Section XX...). Details of chromospheric features are shown in [Figure 2.2](#).


---

<sup>1</sup>Percentages by mass.



**Figure 2.1** Image of the photosphere together with a schema of the solar interior structure. The inset shows the granular surface with a sunspot. The figure is based on a SDO/HMI continuum image from 20 March 2016, credit: NASA/SDO and the AIA, EVE and HMI science teams.

The Sun's atmosphere is dominated by the varying small- and large-scale solar magnetic field configuration. There are regions where the magnetic field lines arc back to the surface and regions with open field lines. In the latter areas the coronal plasma can – guided by the field – escape into space. Thus these coronal areas are less dense, cooler and therefore appear darker in extreme ultraviolet (EUV) and are called coronal holes (more in Section XX...). In [Figure 2.2](#) a coronal hole is located at the solar south pole.




**Figure 2.2** Composite image of the solar atmosphere and some of its features. Corona, chromosphere and photosphere are seen in wavelengths of 193 Å, 304 Å and continuum. Chromospheric spicules are visible on the northern limb. The enlargements on the right show a prominence and a filament. The dark region at the south pole is a coronal hole. The left inset shows details of the active region belonging to the sunspots in [Figure 2.1](#). The figure is based on SDO/AIA images from 20 March 2016, credit: NASA/SDO and the AIA, EVE and HMI science teams.

From Earth, the faint corona and chromosphere can only be observed during eclipses, because of the brightness of the solar disk. There are three effects contributing to the visibility of the corona: photon scattering off free electrons and dust particles, and ion spectral emission lines (termed K-, F- and E-corona). The image of a solar eclipse reveals the coronal plasma, shaped by the magnetic field, and features of the red chromosphere, pictured in [Figure 2.3](#).



**Figure 2.3** Total solar eclipse image of the inner corona up to 5 solar radii. The picture was taken in Mongolia, 1 August 2008 and is processed from multiple images. The magnetic field's dipole structure and the equatorial streamer belt, typical for a quiet Sun in cycle minimum, are visible. Credit: Miloslav Druckmüller, Peter Aniol, Jan Sládeček, 2008, reproduced with permission.

Due to the high coronal temperatures, plasma escapes from the solar gravitational field (Parker 1958) with velocities of  $200\text{--}800 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . Its acceleration is linked to the coronal heating, however the exact location and process remain an open question (cite?). The magnetic field becomes too weak to guide the coronal plasma at a distance of a few solar radii (74–20). From this source surface the solar wind flows radially outward into space until it reaches the termination shock, spanning the heliosphere. Eventually it collides with the local interstellar medium, creating the heliopause. The heliosphere is expected to be a bubble of teardrop shape (and may be led by a bow shock), caused by the Sun's relative velocity of  $23 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  to the local interstellar medium (Owens & Forsyth 2013). Measurements of the Voyager 1 and 2 spacecraft indicate their passage of the termination shock at about 94 au and 84 au, entering the heliosheath region (Owens & Forsyth 2013). Gurnett et al. (2013) report that in 2012 Voyager 1 actually crossed the heliopause into interstellar space at a solar distance of 121 au. Figure 2.4 illustrates the heliosphere and its surrounding flow structure.




**Figure 2.4** Schema of the heliosphere and its surrounding flow structure. The heliosphere is formed by the interaction of the solar wind with the local interstellar medium at the heliopause. Credit: Owens & Forsyth (2013, Fig. 9).

On its way outwards through the solar system, the solar wind – carrying the solar magnetic field – interacts with the planets, their magnetic fields and other solar system bodies. These interactions have various effects, for instance disturbances in planetary magnetic fields with appearance of aurorae and enhanced radiation, atmospheric losses and stripping of cometary tails. Some of these effects can have disruptive consequences for humans and their technology. The topic of space weather effects is further addressed in section 2.8. The magnitude of these effects depends highly on spatial and temporal variations in the solar wind, which are rooted in the dynamics of the solar magnetic field.


## 2.2 Solar dynamics

The spin conservation of the contracting molecular cloud led to a rotation of the Sun with a current average period of about 25 days. The radial convective motion within the solar interior above the tachocline leads to a transport of momentum away from the rotation axis and therefore to a slower polar and faster equatorial

rotation in the convection zone (Miesch 2005). This differential rotation is visible on the surface and was first discovered from sunspot observations. With a rotation period of about 34 days the poles have a lag of almost 9 days (for further information on solar rotation see appendix section A.5). The differential rotation in the solar interior can be inferred from helioseismological observations, see Figure 2.5.



**Figure 2.5** Angular rotation velocity in the solar interior. The radiation zone has a nearly solid rotation. Above the tachocline (dashed line) begins the differential rotation of the convection zone. The angular velocity is inferred from helioseismology via observations from the Michelson Doppler Imager (MDI) at the Solar and Heliospheric Observatory (SOHO) spacecraft. Credit: Thompson et al. (2003, Fig. 3).




**Figure 2.6** Meridional flow velocity profile in part of the convection zone. Positive values are directed towards north. The velocity is inferred from helioseismology via observations from the Helioseismic Magnetic Imager (HMI) at the Solar Dynamics Observatory (SDO) spacecraft. Credit: Zhao et al. (2013, Fig. 4, panel a), reproduced with permission, © AAS.

Turbulent plasma motions from convective flows in the convection zone generate and carry magnetic flux. The large rotational shear at the tachocline stretches and amplifies the disorganized magnetic fields ( $\omega$ -effect) to strong coherent toroidal flux with intensities of the order 1–10 T. These toroidal fields, generated near the bottom of the convection zone, can be stored in a deep magnetic layer located in the stably stratified region below the convection zone (Ossendrijver 2003). The stronger flux ropes become buoyant and raise to the surface. The Coriolis force twists them systematically, the twist is stronger at higher latitudes (Joy's law), on their way through the convection zone ( $\alpha$ -effect) and they emerge then on the photosphere as bipolar active regions – the stronger ones forming pairs of sunspots, see Figure 2.7. Turbulent convective diffusion of this surface flux contributes to the build-up of poloidal fields. Their resulting polarity is opposite to the prevailing global field, due to the directional way the rotational shear at the tachocline and the Coriolis force in the convection zone act. In these processes fluctuating motions further amplify the mean fields. This solar  $\alpha$ - $\omega$ -dynamo is thought to create the major part of the solar magnetic field. Still, with regard to the magnetic field's high variability, the long-term mean fields are governed by intermittent localized structures, that is, active regions, filaments and coronal loops (Miesch 2005).


the  $\alpha$ - $\omega$ -dynamo, see Figure 2.8

## 2.3 Solar activity cycle

Helioseismic measurements reveal that the large-scale convective flow is agglomerated into large convection cells with slow meridional flows of a few  $m\ s^{-1}$ , see Figure 2.6. A poleward subsurface flow and equatorward backflow beneath with a further poleward flow below are detected within each hemisphere, comprising a stacked double-cell profile. The meridional circulation flow speed has a major influence on the average 22 year period of the emerging magnetic flux at the solar surface. This period varies and is influenced by the stochastic emergence rate and tilts of active regions and the diffusion from random convective motions (Hathaway &



**Figure 2.7** Continuum image of both sunspots from Figure 2.1, magnetogram from the same region and from the whole solar disk. The magnetogram shows the polarity of the line-of-sight magnetic field component at the photosphere (black/white: inward/outward polarity). The highly concentrated magnetic flux at the sunspots is clearly visible in the magnetogram as well as the extended bipolar magnetic field structure of the whole active region. The solar disk is scaled to the same size as in Figure 2.1. The figure is based on SDO/HMI continuum and magnetogram images from 20 March 2016, credit: NASA/SDO and the AIA, EVE and HMI science teams.




**Figure 2.8** Schemata of the  $\omega$  and the  $\alpha$ -effects. figure really necessary? get permission...


Upton 2016). Within one period the surface magnetic field configuration changes from a dipole structure to a reversed dipole structure with opposite polarity, thus the transition time from one dipole state to the next lasts about 11 years, this period is termed solar cycle.

In the transition phase magnetic flux emerges in belts above and below the solar equator, manifesting as bipolar active regions with sunspots, resulting in a toroidal/multipolar structured magnetic field. At the beginning of a cycle sunspots appear at about  $\pm 20^\circ$  latitude, this shifts towards lower latitudes at the end of a cycle. Thus the plot of sunspots over latitude and time reveals a butterfly pattern (Maunder 1904). This butterfly pattern appears in surface radial magnetic field observations as well, see Figure 2.9. The leading polarity of bipolar regions is opposite in both hemispheres and the leading polarity changes with each cycle (Hale's polarity law). The emerging flux is carried by the slow meridional surface flow poleward, canceling the current dominating polar field polarity and eventually resulting in the polar field switch.

Since regions of strong magnetic flux are visible as sunspots on the photosphere, they were known well before the common era by greek and chinese scholars (Vaquero 2007; Clark & Stephenson 1978). Systematic sunspot observations exist since 1610, shortly after the invention of the telescope. In 1843 Schwabe discovered the 11-year periodicity in the sunspot occurrence (Schröder 2004, p. 124). In 1848 Wolf introduced the sunspot number (SSN), see Figure 2.10, and the solar cycle number (the zeroth in 1749) to record these cycles (Hathaway 2015). The SSN observations show large variations in cycle length (9–14 years) and cycle amplitude, with



**Figure 2.9** Magnetic butterfly diagram of the synoptic radial magnetic field on the solar surface. Yellow represents an outward directed magnetic field (positive), blue inward (negative). The data is obtained from instruments on Kitt Peak National Observatory and from the MDI at the SOHO spacecraft. Credit: David Hathaway, NASA Marshall Space Flight Center (updated version of [Hathaway 2015](#), Fig. 17). Update this figure before printing!



**Figure 2.10** Monthly mean sunspot number (blue) and 13-month smoothed monthly sunspot number (red) since 1954. Credit: [SILSO data/image, Royal Observatory of Belgium, Brussels, 2017](#). Update this figure before printing!!!

peak SSNs in the range 0–300, ([Hathaway 2015](#)). There also exist long-term variations, such as the 70-year Maunder Minimum, during which from 1645 on almost no sunspots were observed, ([Maunder 1890](#)). The source of the variations in the solar cycle periods and amplitudes are variations in the meridional circulation, because their fluctuations are larger than those found in the differential rotation and in the convective motions ([Hathaway 2015](#)).

As the SSN is commonly used as an indicator for solar activity, there exists interest in predicting the course of the actual and upcoming solar cycles. The continuing prediction of an already commenced activity cycle is reliable, but then the prediction of a cycle before it began is more difficult. Though, there are indications that the polar magnetic field strength during the preceding activity minimum is correlated to the strength of the next solar cycle ([Schatten & Sofia 1987](#)). However, [Hathaway & Upton \(2016\)](#) suggest that the predictability of solar cycles is generally limited – accumulated uncertainty produced by stochastic motions in the convection zone makes predictions further than the next solar cycle very unreliable.

## 2.4 Heliospheric magnetic field

near-Sun field configuration changes  
out to heliopause.  
sec:solar wind  
its effects and resulting structures

The ordered dipole structure in solar cycle minimum leads to open polar field regions with large coronal holes and a closed equatorial field belt/streamer belt (clearly visible in [Figure 2.3](#)).


HMF with figures DQCS + Parker spiral

This leads to the chaotic appearance of closed field lines even at higher latitudes/poles and coronal holes covering equatorial regions. tbm

sw in minimum: streamer belt and polar HSSs  
active regions forming streamer belt

fast solar wind emerges from CHs  
slow from closed field streamers; different sources...

This is confirmed by the Ulysses spacecraft, which measured the solar-wind speed in a polar orbit covering more than one solar cycle ([Figure 2.11](#)).



**Figure 2.11** Solar-wind velocity and magnetic field polarity (red/blue) with respect to heliographic latitude for the three orbits of the Ulysses spacecraft during low and high solar activity (upper panels). The data starts left and counterclockwise. The corresponding smoothed SSN (black) and HCS tilt angle (red) are plotted beneath. The background consists of solar images for solar cycle 22 minimum (1996-08-17), solar cycle 23 maximum (2000-07-12), and solar cycle 23 minimum (2006-03-28). The solar disk, inner corona, and outer corona images are from SOHO/EIT (Fe XII at 1950 nm), Mauna Loa K coronameter (700–950 nm), and SOHO/C2 white light coronagraph. Credit: [McComas et al. \(2008, Fig. 1\)](#), reproduced with permission, © American Geophysical Union. ...ask for high res. image?

keywords:  
SSN -> poloidal/toroidal field -> magnetic surface activity (butterfly diagram) -> min/max polar CHs (quiet/active Sun figure) -> HMF (quiet B-field figure) -> quiet HMF Parker spiral (figure) -> solar wind -> slow/fast sw pattern (Ulysses figure))

solar-wind plasma composition and properties -> visible solar-wind structures (coronagraph image; with CME and streamer) -> stream interface (figure) -> in situ measurements (example in situ CIR/HSS plot)

stream interfaces (figure and link to previous CIR plot) -> HCS/HPS

CMEs (link to previous coronagraph image; in situ CME/MC plot; CME schema figure?)

differential rotation/shear at tachocline -> B-field  
meridional flow -> solar cycle period

## 2. Basics

---

dipole structure, open and closed field lines  
polar coronal holes  
streamer/equatorial streamer belt  
solar wind

open field lines (coronal holes) -> HSSs  
equatorial ballerina model -> CIRs (figure?)

The solar differential rotation wraps the magnetic field lines, accumulating tension, leading eventually to relief with a magnetic reconfiguration by field line reconnections.  
-> release of much energy -> flares, CMEs

solar wind's impact on Earth

the rotation axis is tilted from the normal of the ecliptic by  $i_{\odot} = 7.25^\circ$  ([U.S. Nautical Almanac Office 2015](#))  
(refer to or put into appendix??).

## 2.5 Solar wind

see Kivelson1995, p14+91  
first observed at solar eclipses?, before? deduced by Parker from theory/Carrington from geomagnetic storms?

discovered via eclipses?  
see eclipse photo from Druckmüller [Figure 2.3](#)

in 1958 Parker predicted/postulated the solar wind ([Parker 1958](#))  
expanding isothermal atmosphere (solar-wind model)  
continuous supersonic radial outflow of plasma  
-> also Parker spiral of HMF (see [Figure 2.13](#))

## 2.6 Heliospheric magnetic field


reviews: [Balogh & Jokipii \(2009\)](#) (for heliosheath), [Owens & Forsyth \(2013\)](#)

Winterhalter1994 The heliospheric plasma sheet:  
"the narrow heliospheric current sheet (ca. 3000–10 000 km thick), together with the heliospheric plasma sheet in which it is embedded. The heliospheric plasma sheet region is identified by a significantly enhanced plasma beta caused by density enhancements and diminished magnetic field strength and is about 20 to 30 times the thickness of the current sheet."  
heliospheric current sheet (HCS)  
heliospheric plasma sheet (HPS)  
ballerina model... (search figure...)


Photosphere: magnetic bright points (MBP) 1–2 kG  
their convective motion result in wavelike fluctuations of the thin tubes  
low chromosphere: thin flux tubes expand laterally and merge to a homogeneous network field  
below the chromosphere-corona transition region: the network magnetic field expands laterally and merges again to a large-scale canopy (image)

[above the Alfvén critical point – where the wind speed equals the local Alfvén speed at about  $10 R_{\odot}$  – both the inward and outward modes are advected (advect: convect horizontally) outward with the wind superradially expanding magnetic flux tube  
([Cranmer & van Ballegooijen 2005](#))]  
see also paper citations...

analytical solar magnetic field model for solar minimum conditions (Banaszkiewicz et al. 1998)  
 dipole plus quadrupole plus current sheet (DQCS) solar magnetic field model  
 The DQCS model with its quadrupole part having a direct link from the solar equator to infinity along the equatorial plane and current sheet. (see Figure 2.12) (Banaszkiewicz et al. 1998)  
 compare with field geometry from eclipse Figure 2.3...



**Figure 2.12** Solar magnetic field geometry from the DQCS model with field lines (solid) and constant field strength surfaces (dashed). The quadrupole part allows equatorial outflows along the current sheet. Credit: Banaszkiewicz et al. (1998, Fig. 3), reproduced with permission, © ESO.



**Figure 2.13** Illustration of the solar magnetic field Parker spiral formation by rotation of the solar-wind source surface. Between solar-wind flows of opposite magnetic field polarity a heliospheric current sheet (HCS) forms. Credit: Owens & Forsyth (2013, Fig. 1), adapted from Schatten et al. (1969, Fig. 1).

Parker spiral, source surface and HCS, see Figure 2.13

MHD simulations based on Voyager 1 and 2 measurements within the heliosheath indicate the formation of magnetic bubbles (reconnected sector regions) at the sector boundary caused by the compression before the heliopause, flowing away to the heliosheath tail (Opher et al. 2011).

## 2.7 Solar wind properties and structures

list event/structure types

solar-wind structures source regions: sunspots/active regions, coronal holes, filaments

sw density considerations, see presi S<sup>3</sup>

### 2.7.1 Solar wind plasma

Plasma in general (properties (H/He/metal composition; see paper...), Plasma-beta, etc.)  
 solar-wind properties, slow/fast wind, MHD waves (Alfvén waves)

special events/configurations, which can appear (CIRs, HCS/HPS, etc.) HSS, sector boundaries, CIRs, CMEs

### 2.7.2 Slow solar wind

regions with closed lines

trapped plasma, slow solar wind from streamers

### 2.7.3 High speed streams

regions with open lines  
coronal holes as sources of fast sw

sw plot of HSS with CIR to refer to


[Schwenn \(1983\)](#): “During the Skylab era in 1973/74 we learned that these high speed streams emerge from coronal holes (Hundhausen, 1977 and references therein).”

### 2.7.4 Stream interaction regions

Streams of fast wind catch slow wind  
-> compressions, shocks, deflections

Corotating interaction regions (CIRs)  
Stream interaction regions (SIRs)

formation of stream interface and stream deflection, see [Figure 2.14](#)



**Figure 2.14** Schema of the formation of a stream interface (left) and deflection of streams (right), both generated from interactions between slow and fast solar wind. Credit: [Owens & Forsyth \(2013, Fig. 7\)](#); right panel adapted from [Pizzo \(1991, Fig. 2\)](#).

refer to sw figure of CIR

### 2.7.5 HCS / HPS

from sector boundaries (ballerina skirt)

### 2.7.6 Coronal mass ejections

Coronal mass ejections (CMEs) (discovery (Carrington), definition (Hundhausen?), models, GCS (conception of 3-dim CME shape -> enables Earth arrival time forecast from modeled direction and velocity))

active regions:  
sunspots, magnetic reconnections, flares, post-eruptive arcades

coronagraph figure of CME (COR2 image, SECCHI/STEREO)  
in situ solar wind figure of same CME (recent one from 2016)

CME-plasma properties  
+ flares and SEPs often accompany CMEs

### Magnetic clouds

magnetic cloud (MC); refer to in situ plot  
See BS magnetic cloud model in analyses methods chapter MVA...

## 2.8 Space weather

Solar wind influences the Earth's magnetosphere and can disturb sensitive technical systems  
understanding its properties helps with prediction of events

influences on human infrastructure/technical systems

various space weather effects, for instance disturbances in magnetic fields, aurorae, episodes of enhanced radiation, atmospheric losses and stripping of cometary tails. figures of these effects?

reference to [Bothmer & Daglis \(2007\)](#), maybe images


### 2.8.1 Solar influence on Earth

Carrington made first connection between terrestrial magnetic field and solar flares. correct?

there are several types of solar-terrestrial relations, [Bartels \(1962\)](#) listed:

- irregular flare and CME effects (Carrington)
- 11-year solar cycle effects
- 27-day solar rotation effects
- daily effects (x-ray and light)

seasonal effects from Earth orbital distance, inclination (solar rotation axis angle) and Earth tilt (see [Figure 2.15](#))



**Figure 2.15** Sun-Earth geometry in the plane orthogonal to the ecliptic (not to scale); Solar magnetic field-magnetosphere geometry. Seasonal effects are: solar tilt, Earth distance and Earth tilt. make new figure...

solar wind and its species  
solar radiation  
solar energetic particles (SEPs)  
gravitation

magnetosphere  
ionosphere?  
aurorae  
geomagnetic storms (several days, from CMEs)  
substorms (few hours, from CIRs??)

## 2. Basics

for humans and their technology important effects: enhanced radiation, geomagnetic storms  
lovely, disruptive, dangerous consequences <- read in VBbook


at Earth the solar wind total energy flux ( $1.45 \text{ mW/m}^2$ ) is only about one millionth of the solar radiation flux  
(see Schwenn (1990, p. 153))

"The principal users affected by geomagnetic storms are the electrical power grid, spacecraft operations, users of radio signals that reflect off of or pass through the ionosphere, and observers of the aurora." NOAA cite

### 2.8.2 Magnetosphere

shape formed by dynamic pressure..., similar to heliosphere in ISM...

bow shock, magnetotail, magnetosheath, magnetopause  
add ecliptic and terrestrial tilt angle; with plasmoid?  
see Figure 2.16



**Figure 2.16** temp figure "The cavity is called the magnetosphere. It has a relatively well-defined outer boundary, the magnetopause."

turbulence with sw (KH or RT instabilities), see subsection 2.8.4

Earth magnetic field strength at a height of 36 000 km (geostationary):  $\approx 100 \text{ nT}$   
Earth magnetic field strength at the surface - equator:  $\approx 30 000 \text{ nT}$  - poles:  $\approx 60 000 \text{ nT}$  (cite?)

magnetopause = current layer??

two extreme cases of  $B_z$  orientation: parallel/antiparallel  
compression/reconnection (see Figure 2.17)

standoff distance: (Bothmer & Daglis 2007, p. 112)


$$d = \frac{107.4}{1R_E} (NV^2)^{-1/6} \quad (2.1)$$

Even in "ancient" times (when?) a correlation between solar particles and disturbances in the magnetosphere were known of (Bartels 1962).

magnetosphere variations due to solar wind  
magnetosphere protects from radiation (maybe from solar wind stripping atmosphere away?)

effects: aurorae, ...

ring current systems



**Figure 2.17** reconnection and compression depending on the interplanetary magnetic field orientation. Credit: Bothmer & Daglis (2007, p. 116, Fig. 4.8), adapted from Dungey 1961, 1963. get permission... accelerated flows are arrowed; N points are X points...

definition of:

magnetic storm...

substorm...

subsection Ionosphere?

its variations due to solar radiation (day/night cycle and flares)

ionosphere -> TEC -> GNSS error

### 2.8.3 Geomagnetic indices

Geomagnetic observatories are distributed widely over the globe, measuring the local magnetic field at their position. Several sets of stations, covering specific regions, are defined to monitor the state of different parts of the magnetospheric system. Magnetic measurements from these sets define several geomagnetic indices. The International Association of Geomagnetism and Aeronomy (IAGA) supports the following global geomagnetic indices which are serviced by the International Service of Geomagnetic Indices (ISGI)<sup>2</sup>: The *aa* index is designed to represent the amplitude of the global geomagnetic activity, normalized to a geomagnetic latitude of  $\pm 50^\circ$ . The *am* index characterizes the global geomagnetic activity. The *Kp* index is designed to measure geomagnetic disturbances from solar particle radiation [reword...]. The *Kp* index is described in more detail in subsection 3.2.2. The *Dst* index monitors the intensity of the magnetospheric ring current. The *PC* index monitors the polar cap magnetic activity – it approximates the amount of energy which entered the magnetosphere through solar-wind coupling. The *AE* index and its relatives *AU*, *AL* and *AO* measure the magnetic effects of the northern auroral electrojet. The first three listed indices (*aa*, *am* and *Kp*) are calculated from different sets of local 3-hourly *K* indices, which measure the local magnetic disturbances at the observatories. There exist several more indices that are based on some of those listed above.

[for *Kp*, *AA* and *Dst* read Section 7.4 in book Bothmer & Daglis (2007)...  
*Dst* (read book Jursa 1985 p. 4-31)]

### 2.8.4 Solar wind–magnetosphere coupling

E-field:

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{IMF}}? = -\mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{B}_{\text{IMF}} \quad (2.2)$$

...derive from Lorentz force

(Because of high plasma conductivity the E-field is not existent.)

<sup>2</sup>ISGI website: <http://isgi.unistra.fr/>

## 2. Basics

---

Axford1964 viscous interaction (of turbulent nature, KH/RT instabilities, KH instabilities at the flanks of the magnetosphere) is a viable source of drag force/solar storm energy input into magnetosphere

Otto&Nykyri1982 KH instabilities/vortices force magnetic reconnection even at northern IMF and are able to account for observed mass flux

Newell et al. (2007) and Newell et al. (2008): coupling consists of merging and viscous part (reconnection and turbulence)

merging part: rate magnetic flux is opened at the magnetopause

viscous part: reconnection due to Kelvin-Helmholtz instabilities at the boundary

Merkin2013 MHD simulation of velocity shear at magnetosphere boundary with northern IMF; KH instabilities; double-vortex sheet structure

# 3 Data

## 3.1 Instruments

For analyzing the solar wind and related effects on the Sun there are remote instruments (solar imager and coronagraphs) and in situ instruments (magnetometer and plasma detector).

Here the basic principles of the latter are described, because the analyses performed in this thesis are based on in situ solar-wind measurements.

### 3.1.1 Magnetometer

Spacecraft nowadays carry two different magnetometer types, one for measuring the magnetic field direction and its strength and the other for observing the magnetic flux and detecting waves.

A flux gate magnetometer consists of two coils around a core – one coil with alternating current, which is compared with the induced current signal from the other. Without external magnetic field both patterns match. The core is easier magnetized in direction of an existing external magnetic field, in which case the patterns differ. It measures...

In a search coil magnetometer one coil is placed around a core; measures plasma waves - where?

Because these magnetometer types are directional, they often are placed in two sets of triaxial configurations, attached on booms to minimize the influence of the spacecraft's own magnetic field.

L-> which is generated by surface charges?/electrons?/ionization?/the instruments?

### 3.1.2 Plasma detector

several spectrometers with different energy ranges

isotope spectrometer - isotopic abundances of SEPs


ionic charge analyzer - charge state of SEPs

sw ion mass spectrometer -

sw ion composition spectrometer -

radio burst tracker

A plasma detector measures the ion energy frequency distribution, which consists basically only of protons and alphas in solar wind (see [Figure 3.1](#)). see also [subsection 2.7.1](#)



**Figure 3.1** Example of an ion energy spectrum with synthetic data. Here proton and helium (alpha) peaks are distinguishable...

### 3. Data

---

From the energy spectrum the velocity, density and temperature can be derived.

The bulk velocity is derived from the distribution's average energy.

The number density is the area of the distribution.

The temperature scales with the distribution's width.

## 3.2 Data sources

Different kind of data are used for the investigations in this thesis – collected from observatories at various locations.

Spacecraft / data sets

Positions:

Earth:

imager, magnetosphere

L1 - first Lagrangian point:

ACE (siehe auch space weather spacecraft Liste)

Wind etc. (OMNI)

DSCOVR

1 au orbit

STEREO A and B

inner heliosphere:

Helios 1 and 2

PSP


outer heliosphere:

Voyager 1 and 2

Ulysses

also RT-data sources? Wind, ACE, SOHO?, STEREO A and B, DSCOVR

A time coverage overview of the data sets used in the analyses of this thesis (SSN,  $K_p$  index, LRO, HRO, Helios 1 and 2) is plotted in [Figure 3.2](#).



**Figure 3.2** Time coverage of the  $K_p$  index, low and high resolution OMNI, Helios 1 and Helios 2 data sets until end of 2016. The SIDC 13-month smoothed monthly SSN is plotted in the background. add cycle number...

### 3.2.1 Sunspot number

SSN history in section basics

add SSN figure of history incl. Maunder minimum?

SIDC/SILSO...

SSN Version 2.0

WDC-SILSO – World Data Center-Sunspot Index and Long-term Solar Observations


**Table 3.1** Defined table for the conversion from the  $K_p$  index to the equivalent  $ap$  index, which represents the magnetic field strength in units of 2 nT.

| $K_p$ | 0o | 0+ | 1- | 1o | 1+ | 2- | 2o  | 2+  | 3-  | 3o  | 3+  | 4-  | 4o  | 4+  |
|-------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| $ap$  | 0  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7   | 9   | 12  | 15  | 18  | 22  | 27  | 32  |
| $K_p$ | 5- | 5o | 5+ | 6- | 6o | 6+ | 7-  | 7o  | 7+  | 8-  | 8o  | 8+  | 9-  | 9o  |
| $ap$  | 39 | 48 | 56 | 67 | 80 | 94 | 111 | 132 | 154 | 179 | 207 | 236 | 300 | 400 |

### 3.2.2 $K_p$ index

Julius Bartels introduced the  $K$  index in 1938 and designed it to measure the intensity of geomagnetic disturbances (Bartels et al. 1939). Its name originates from 'Kennziffer' – the german word for characteristic digit. The  $K$  index is a measure for the maximal variation of the surface magnetic field, observed in a magnetogram within 3-hour intervals. Its scale in the range 0–9 is a quasi-logarithmic representation of the actual magnetic field strength's variations.

The Planetary  $K$  index ( $K_p$ ) is a planetary geomagnetic disturbance index, introduced by Bartels in 1949 at the Institute for Geophysics, University of Göttingen (Bartels & Veldkamp 1949).  $K_p$  is the weighted average of 13  $K_s$  indices, which are the standardized versions of the local  $K$  indices measured at 13 observatories. These contributing observatories are located around  $\pm 50^\circ$  geomagnetic latitude and their distribution is biased towards Europe (see Figure 3.3).



**Figure 3.3** Distribution of the 13  $K_p$  observatories. Courtesy of International Service of Geomagnetic Indices (ISGI), 2013.


To benefit from its higher precision, its scale, in the range 0–9 as well, is further divided into thirds, represented by the suffixes '+', 'o' and '-' (e.g., 3o, 3+, 4-, 4o). The  $K_p$  indices are often visualized in musical diagrams, where they are stacked into periods of 27 days to enable the detection of recurrent activities, as seen in Figure 3.4.

The  $K_p$  index can be converted to the 3-hour equivalent  $ap$  index, which represents the magnetic field strength at a surface position of about  $50^\circ$  dipole latitude. The conversion is done via a table defined by Bartels, in which the value of the  $ap$  index is scaled in units of 2 nT (see Table 3.1). There are further geomagnetic indices which are derived from the  $K_p$  index. They include  $Ap$ , the daily  $ap$  average,  $Cp$ , the daily  $ap$  sum mapped via a defined table to the range 0–2.5 and  $C9$ , a mapping of  $Cp$  via a defined table to the range 0–9. The definitions of Q-days (quiet days) and D-days (disturbed days) are also obtained from the  $K_p$  index.

The International Association of Geomagnetism and Aeronomy (IAGA) adopted the  $K_p$  index in 1954. The  $K_p$  index was maintained in Göttingen until January 1997 – now the German Research Centre for Geosciences (GFZ) in Potsdam supplies the  $K_p$  index and thereof derived indices. The GFZ provides historical and quick-look data of the indices via their website<sup>1</sup>. The data was extended backwards and is available from 1932

<sup>1</sup>GFZ website for geomagnetic indices: <http://www.gfz-potsdam.de/de/kp-index/> (existent in 2017-10-29)

### 3. Data



**Figure 3.4** Bartels musical  $K_p$  diagram for the time period from September until end of December 2016. Two sudden commencements with following geomagnetic storms, having a maximal  $K_p$  of 6+, can be seen in October. Credit: GFZ Potsdam, 2017, licensed under CC BY 4.0.

onwards.

further uses of the  $K_p$  index:  
The NOAA G-Scale for geomagnetic storms (G 1 to G 5) is based on the  $K_p$  index<sup>2</sup>.  
GNSS error, auroral boundary positions

“It is designed to measure solar particle radiation by its magnetic effects.”

#### 3.2.3 OMNI data set

a data set merged from different sources

The OMNI data (King & Papitashvili 2005) were obtained from the GSFC/SPDF OMNIWeb interface.

from spacecraft located near the Lagrange point L1 upstream of Earth  
time-shifted to the bow shock of the magnetosphere

OMNI2 H0 MRG1HR (1963–201308) Cite from CDAweb: Hourly near-Earth solar-wind magnetic field and plasma data, energetic proton fluxes ( $> 1$  to  $> 60$  MeV), and geomagnetic and solar activity indices.

NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), Space Physics Data Facility (SPDF): <http://spdf.gsfc.nasa.gov/>


- Coordinated Data Analysis Web (CDAWeb): <http://cdaweb.gsfc.nasa.gov/>
- OMNIWeb Plus: <http://omniweb.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

intercalibrated multi-spacecraft solar-wind data  
Various spacecraft contribute to the interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) and solar-wind plasma OMNI data, as seen in Figure 3.5.

#### Solar Wind Structures

Solar Wind Structures (SWS) list  
derived by Richardson.... from OMNI data (only?)

<sup>2</sup>NOAA Space Weather Scales website: <http://www.swpc.noaa.gov/noaa-scales-explanation> (existent in 2017-10-29)



**Figure 3.5** IMF and solar-wind plasma data source spacecraft for the high and the low resolution OMNI (HRO, LRO) data sets until end of 2016. The SIDC 13-month smoothed monthly SSN is plotted in the background. add cycle number...

permission received.


characterization of near-Earth solar-wind structures since 1963  
SWS lists (Richardson et al. 2000) and (Richardson & Cane 2012)

### 3.2.4 Helios probes


see Helios data readme.txt  
see paper

two different fluxgate magnetometers and a search coil magnetometer

see Figure 3.6



**Figure 3.6** One of the nearly identical twin Helios spacecraft. Credit: NASA/Max Planck Institute for Solar System Research.




**Figure 3.7** Plot of the Helios probes' solar distance and HGI latitude over their mission time, together with the monthly SSN and 13-month smoothed monthly SSN.

### 3. Data

---

solar distance, HGI latitude and sunspot number during the Helios missions; see [Figure 3.7](#)

Helios 1 and 2 orbits in the ecliptic plane and in the latitude polar plane (see [Figure 3.8](#))



**Figure 3.8** Orbit of the Helios 1 (red) and Helios 2 (green) spacecraft in the solar equatorial plane (left) and polar plane (right) (HGI-coordinates). change colors?

The Helios magnetic field and plasma data frequency over heliocentric distance and over heliographic latitude are plotted in [Figure 3.9](#).


Solar wind data courtesy of R. Schwenn, Max-Planck-Institut für Aeronomie, Lindau, magnetic field data courtesy of F. Neubauer, Universität zu Köln. (see paper; into acknowledgements...)

data sources – see paper for replacing the following data  
 solar-wind parameters: ACE, Helios, OMNI  
 geomagnetic indices: K<sub>p</sub>, OMNI

Space Physics Data Facility (SPDF)

HELIOS 1 and 2 - orbital Parameters  
<http://spdf.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/pub/data/helios/helios1/traj/>  
<http://spdf.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/pub/data/helios/helios2/traj/>

Helios hourly merged mag & plasma data:  
 HELIOS1\_COHO1HR\_MERGED\_MAG\_PLASMA\_2965.txt  
 HELIOS2\_COHO1HR\_MERGED\_MAG\_PLASMA\_3096.txt  
<http://cdaweb.gsfc.nasa.gov>  
 temporal coverage of merged data  
 Helios 1: 1974-12-10 - 1981-06-14  
 Mag data availability: 42.6 %  
 Plasma & orbit data availability: 76.4 %  
 Helios 2: 1976-01-01 - 1980-03-04  
 Mag data availability: 54.4 %  
 Plasma & orbit data availability: 91.8 %



**Figure 3.9** Helios data frequency over heliocentric distance with bins of 0.01 au (left panels) and over heliographic latitude with bins of 0.1° (right panels). The frequency data is based on the hourly merged magnetometer and plasma data sets for Helios 1 and Helios 2. The top panels show the frequencies for Helios 1 and Helios 2 individually and the bottom panels those for the magnetometer and plasma data. avoid white lines...

### 3.2.5 Parker Solar Probe

Sun angular diameter comparison, see presi S<sup>3</sup>

### 3.2.6 Real-time solar-wind data

Advanced Composition Explorer  
s/c figure, launch date was 25 August 1997

MAG – fluxgate magnetometer  
SWEPAM

data errors/gaps...

DSCOVR as replacement was launched on 11 Februar 2015. It is NOAA's SWPC real-time solar-wind prime source since 27 July 2016.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup><http://www.swpc.noaa.gov/products/real-time-solar-wind>



## 4 Chapter2 – Solar wind and CME influence on the magnetosphere

Impact estimations derived from empirical correlations between in situ solar wind measurements and the geomagnetic  $K_p$  index

Magnetospheric variations are largely evoked by influence through the solar wind. These magnetospheric disturbances have diverse effects on the terrestrial environment. Especially the effects of the severe geomagnetic storms created by coronal mass ejections (CMEs) pose various threats to sensitive technical systems and exposed humans. Thus the development of quantitative forecasts for magnetospheric impacts caused by solar wind and CMEs is very important.

This study's goals are to estimate the magnetospheric impact from solar activity in general, from solar wind and also to predict it for CMEs in particular. We present empirical dependencies between specific solar wind parameters and the magnetospheric disturbance index  $K_p$ . These dependencies allow to nowcast the  $K_p$  index from upstream (L1) solar wind in situ measurements. Hence, also the magnetospheric impact of CMEs is estimated solely based on their from coronagraphic observations predicted arrival velocities. The prediction of solar wind stream velocities from coronal hole (CH) observations enables the estimation of their impact as well.

First, we estimate the long-term variations of the yearly average  $K_p$  values, which are contributed by solar activity. This is achieved via logarithmic fitting of the yearly sunspot number (SSN) dependency. For the  $K_p$  nowcast from general solar wind conditions we use a correlation with the product of the parameters velocity and magnetic field z-component in GSM coordinates ( $vB_z$ ). For the  $K_p$  forecast from estimated CME and stream velocities we furthermore filter the solar wind data by flagged CME times from the solar wind structures (SWS) list provided by [Richardson & Cane \(2012\)](#). The used solar wind data consists of 35 years (1981–2016) of high-resolution minutely OMNI data, which is composed of multi-spacecraft intercalibrated in situ measurements from 1 au. We evaluate various data processing methods and choose the methods resulting in the highest correlation coefficients with  $K_p$ . We analyze the  $K_p$  frequency distributions with respect to the depending parameters  $vB_z$  and velocity, derive their mean  $K_p$  per interval and further compile functional dependencies via logarithmic fitting.

The obtained functional relations enable us to empirically estimate the mean  $K_p$  impact from measured solar activity, in situ solar wind, remotely observed CMEs and CHs.

### 4.1 Introduction

It is long known (since the early 19th century) that variations in the solar wind evoke disturbances in the magnetosphere ([Bartels 1962](#)). Especially strong disturbances, called geomagnetic storms, can be provoked by coronal mass ejections (CMEs), which are embedded within the solar wind. The causes of the strongest geomagnetic storms are the compression of the solar wind magnetic field lines within the CME shock front and the in CMEs enclosed magnetic clouds with their enhanced field strengths ([Bothmer 1993](#)).

These strong geomagnetic disturbances are a threat to sensitive technical systems and exposed humans. Therefore it is important to know when magnetospheric disturbances will occur and how large they will be.

The goal of this paper is to estimate the magnetospheric impact of solar wind in general and to predict it for CMEs in particular.

First we determine the magnitudes of the long-time  $K_p$  changes due to solar activity (Sect. ...) and second we measure the extent of seasonal variations stemming from the Earth's orbit (Sect. ...).

In situ measurements of solar wind are made almost continuously (e.g., at the first Lagrange point (L1)) in front of the magnetosphere. Since 1963 several spacecraft collected more than 50 years of data. The latest

spacecraft, e.g., Wind, ACE and DSCOVR (launched in early 2015), provide real-time solar wind data.<sup>1 2 3</sup>

This real-time data can be used to estimate various solar wind effects, e.g., the position of the magnetospheric bow shock in front of the Earth, the magnitude of geomagnetic disturbances ( $K_p$  index), the positions of the polar auroral ovals, the variation of the total electron content (TEC) of the ionosphere, the positional error of global navigation satellite systems (GNSS),...

The equatorward auroral boundary position correlates with the  $K_p$  index.

The total electron content (TEC) of the ionosphere has influence on global navigation satellite systems (GNSS). A part of their positional error scales directly with the TEC (in extreme cases up to about 30 m).

The velocity and direction of CMEs can be determined in their early near-Sun stages via remote tracking with coronagraph white-light observations. Using these parameters as input for propagation models, their possible arrival time and arrival velocity at Earth can be derived.

As coronal holes are the origin of the fast solar wind, their area on the solar disk, seen in EUV images, correlates with the measured velocity of solar wind streams (Vršnak et al. 2007). This is used to predict the Earth arrival velocity of solar wind streams about 4 days in advance (Rotter et al. 2012).<sup>4</sup>

With our results presented here we elaborate the step from the predicted CME and stream velocities to the forecast of the possible impact strength on the Earth's magnetosphere.

[Elliott et al. (2013): The  $K_p$  index and solar wind speed relationship: Insights for improving space weather forecasts]

We make an empirical correlation of the solar wind speed with the geomagnetic  $K_p$  index to obtain the capability to forecast  $K_p$  values solely based on the predicted CME and stream velocities.

The used OMNI data set consists of minutely data in the time range 1981-01-01 to 2016-12-31.

The derived functional dependencies can be used to nowcast/forecast the  $K_p$  index.

why use the  $K_p$  index?

## 4.2 Long-term variations of the $K_p$ index

### 4.2.1 $K_p$ data

The  $K_p$  data is obtained from the GFZ Potsdam<sup>5</sup>, where the index is now maintained. The data used in this analysis covers the time period 1932–2016.

The  $K_p$  frequency distribution for the time period 1932–2016 shows that the highest frequencies occur around low  $K_p$  values of 1+ and to higher  $K_p$  values the frequencies seem to decline exponentially (see Fig. 4.1). A  $K_p$  value of 90 occurred only 29 times in this time interval.

### 4.2.2 $K_p$ variations with solar activity

solar activity is tracked with the sunspot number (SSN); SSN data

The general  $K_p$  distribution, seen before in Fig. 4.1, averages over solar activity. With different states of solar activity the  $K_p$  frequency distributions' shape varies. This can be seen from the yearly distributions, sorted and colored by yearly SSN (see Fig. 4.2). The distribution's peak position scales with SSN, that is, a high yearly


<sup>1</sup>Wind: <https://pwg.gsfc.nasa.gov/windnrt/>

<sup>2</sup>ACE: <http://www.swpc.noaa.gov/products/ace-real-time-solar-wind>


<sup>3</sup>DSCOVR: <http://www.swpc.noaa.gov/products/real-time-solar-wind>

<sup>4</sup><http://swe.uni-graz.at/index.php/services/solar-wind-forecast>

<sup>5</sup><http://www.gfz-potsdam.de/de/kp-index>



**Figure 4.1**  $K_p$  frequency distribution for the time period 1932–2016.  $K_p$  data from the GFZ Potsdam.



**Figure 4.2** Yearly  $K_p$  frequency distributions of the period 1932–2016 sorted and colored by SSN.  $K_p$  data from the GFZ Potsdam and the yearly SSN from the SILSO World Data Center.


SSN results also in more large  $K_p$  values.

The time series of yearly average  $K_p$  values in the time span 1932–2016 shows an imprint of the solar cycles (see the top graphs in Fig. 4.3). The  $K_p$  pattern follows the solar cycle minima and maxima as well as the changes in magnitude between solar cycles. The yearly mean  $K_p$  shifts about 1 unit for both variations.


As expected, the  $K_p$  index correlation with solar activity shows an 11-year period (see bottom graph in Fig. 4.3). The highest correlation coefficient 0.60 is found with a time lag of  $-1$  year, that is, the yearly average  $K_p$  follows the SSN of the previous year.

cause are CHs, see paper...


The yearly mean  $K_p$  indices with respect to the 1-year lagged SSN show a raise in  $K_p$  with increasing SSN, which is seen in Fig. 4.4.



**Figure 4.3** Yearly  $K_p$  index from GFZ Potsdam and yearly SSN from the SILSO World Data Center (1932–2016) with cycle number (top). The correlation coefficients with the yearly SSN are calculated for time lags back to  $-15$  years (bottom).



**Figure 4.4** Yearly mean  $K_p$  index over 1-year lagged SSN (+) with the weighted logarithmic fit (dashed). The error bars denote the SSN standard deviation and the relative weight from the yearly data coverage. The shaded area represents the fit error band derived from the estimated standard deviations of the fit parameters. The function (4.1) is used for the weighted fit. The yearly  $K_p$  mean values are obtained from GFZ Potsdam data and the yearly SSN from the SILSO World Data Center.



**Figure 4.5** Monthly  $K_p$  frequency distributions colored by months of the year.  $K_p$  data of the time period 1932–2016 from the GFZ Potsdam.

We perform a fit to obtain an analytical relation for this dependency.  $K_p$  itself is a quasi-logarithmic index, so it is apparent to use a logarithmic fit function:

$$f(x) = a \cdot \ln(x) + b. \quad (4.1)$$

The fitted parameter values are  $a = 0.281(43)$  and  $b = 1.05(19)$  and lead to the relation

$$K_p(ssn) = 0.28 \cdot \ln(ssn) + 1.1. \quad (4.2)$$

In the fit result, plotted in Fig. 4.4, the mean  $K_p$  is 1.05(19) for a SSN of 1 and 2.53(30) for a SSN of 200. The fit error band has a width of about half a  $K_p$  unit.


### 4.2.3 Seasonal $K_p$ variations

There also are seasonal variations in the magnetospheric disturbances. Looking at the monthly  $K_p$  frequency distributions for different seasons of the year, it is apparent that in the months May–August the  $K_p$  peak frequency is higher than in the rest of the year (see Fig. 4.5). In March/April and September/October the  $K_p$  values  $> 3$  are more abundant.

These seasonal  $K_p$  changes arise from seasonal variations of the solar wind parameters at Earth, which stem from Earth's yearly changes in orbital distance and heliographic latitude (as discussed in Sect. XX of MVVB $\ddot{\text{P}}$ aper). Another seasonal effect comes from the Earth's rotation axis tilt ( $\pm 23.44^\circ$ ) (obliquity to the ecliptic), which changes the direction of the Earth's magnetic dipole axis to the Sun over the year (see bottom panel of Fig. 4.6). The rate of magnetic reconnection between solar wind and magnetosphere depends on both fields' direction to each other (parallel/antiparallel) (see Figure in Basics...).

$K_p$  seasonal variation effects from seasonal changing Sun tilt, Earth tilt and Earth distance. causes (see citetRangarajan1997 p. 1282 and mention Bartels1963 too):

- Earth's rotation axis tilt ( $\pm 23.44^\circ$ ) (obliquity to orbit/inclination of equator)



**Figure 4.6** *K<sub>p</sub>* frequency distributions by month for the time period 1932–2016 with median and quartile values (top). Solar tilt angle to Earth, Earth tilt angle to Sun and Earth distance to Sun are approximated with trigonometric functions (bottom). switch panels...

- solar rotation axis tilt ( $\pm 7.25^\circ$ ) (cite 'NASA Earth fact sheet')
  - Earth's varying solar distance of  $\pm 1.67\%$
- read Bothmer1998 Ch 3...

We quantify the magnitude of these effects. *K<sub>p</sub>* frequency distributions by month, see Fig. 4.6. for high *K<sub>p</sub>* values ( $> 4$ ?) there are yearly frequency maxima at the equinoxes and minima at the solstices. this variation amounts to more than 1 *K<sub>p</sub>* unit...

The magnitudes of the SSN variation *K<sub>p(ssn)</sub>* and the seasonal variation *K<sub>p(month)</sub>* are of a similar order...?

Both variations are an indirect influence through solar wind (see paper).

## 4.3 ***K<sub>p</sub>* nowcast from in situ solar wind measurements**

### 4.3.1 Solar wind-magnetosphere coupling

The coupling between the solar wind and the magnetosphere is governed by reconnection and compression of the magnetic field lines (see Basics...).

the dayside reconnection is asymmetric

To describe this, some coupling functions with different complexity were proposed (Newell, cites? and list).

dayside reconnection:

" $E_y$  is the rate at which southward magnetic flux is convected to the magnetosphere by the solar wind ( $-v_x \cdot B_z$ ) in GSM coordinates," (Russell 2007)


the product of the proton velocity  $v$  and the magnetic field z-component in geocentric solar magnetospheric (GSM) coordinates  $B_z$ :

$$?checkvectors E_y = -v_x \cdot B_z \text{ (GSM)} \quad (4.3)$$

If not specified otherwise,  $B_z$  is always meant to be in GSM coordinates hereafter.

argue for  $vB_z$ :

- $3\text{min}(vB_z)$  performs in rank correlation slightly better than the sophisticated Newell formula. really?
- simple to calculate



**Figure 4.7**  $K_p$ - $vB_z$  correlation coefficients for different time shifts. Minutely OMNI data from 1981–2016 processed with mean (black) and minimum (red) 3-hour averaging.

- ...

We settle for  $vB_z$  as the coupling function to analyze.

It also is known that the solar wind velocity itself already correlates strongly with the  $K_p$  index. In fact Machol et al. (2013) even proposed a linear function of the  $K_p$  index as a best proxy for corrupted real-time velocity measurements made by the Advanced Composition Explorer (ACE) spacecraft.

### 4.3.2 Data set, data processing and correlation

The  $K_p$  time series started in 1932 when there were no spacecraft to measure in situ solar wind. Thus, the surveyed time range is defined by the available in situ solar wind data. The OMNI data set collects the longest continuous solar wind measurements at 1 au, it covers hourly data since 1963; 5-minute and minutely data since 1981.

why this data set? - because of long time coverage, to magnetospheric bow shock calculated solar wind and integrated geomagnetic indices (see Paper...)

The  $K_p$  index represents maximal variations within 3-hour time intervals. Any solar wind parameter that will be correlated with it also has to have the same time resolution. Additionally to adapting the time resolution, we have to consider by which means it should be done. Simple 3-hour average values should have a lower correlation coefficient than the solar wind parameter's 3-hourly maximal variation.

The 3-hour maximal variations are obviously higher when using high resolution data. Thus, to be able to correlate  $K_p$  with solar wind data, high resolution data (e.g., 1 min) is needed to determine the maximal solar wind variations within each 3-hour interval.

The longest time coverage has the hourly OMNI data set (since 1963), however we prefer to use the minutely OMNI data with the time range 1981–2016, to benefit from higher correlation coefficients (see Figs?).


Pearson correlation coefficients; use Spearman rank instead?  
correlate positive and negative values separately?

$K_p$ - $vB_z$  Pearson correlation coefficients for mean and minimum, see Fig. 4.7.


The largest correlation is found for the 3-hour minimum data without time shift. It is a negative correlation with a coefficient of  $-0.72$ .

We use  $vB_z$  3-hour minimum values, as a result their frequency distribution and its peak is asymmetrically shifted to negative values, as seen in Fig. 4.8.

even the 3-hour mean shows a slight offset in position (why?)



**Figure 4.8** Frequency distributions of  $vB_z$  for 3-hour mean (black) and minimum (red) minutely OMNI data from 1981–2016.



**Figure 4.9**  $K_p$  versus  $vB_z$  frequency distribution (top) and its relative distribution (bottom) with the mean  $K_p$  values (solid) and their mean absolute deviation (dotted). It is 3-hour minimum data from the minutely OMNI data set (1981–2016). The bin size is 500 km  $s^{-1}$  nT and 1/3  $K_p$  unit respectively.

### 4.3.3 Functional dependency


The frequency distribution over the  $K_p$ - $vB_z$  space is shaped like a candle flame inclined to negative values by a light breeze, see top panel in Fig. 4.9.

To determine a functional dependency we look at the relative frequencies per  $vB_z$  interval and their mean  $K_p$  values, which are plotted in the bottom panel of Fig. 4.9. The mean absolute deviation (MAD) of the mean has a mean size of 0.7  $K_p$  units. This probability distribution is asymmetrically V-shaped around zero, having a larger and steeper negative arm. This effect is not a result of the data reducing method (3-hour minimum), because for 3-hour mean data the asymmetry also exists (fig. ...?). Rather the steeper negative arm is a consequence of the half-wave rectifier coupling of the solar wind magnetic field direction to the magnetosphere as described in Sect (coupling section...).

Since the  $K_p$  index has a quasi-logarithmic scaling (see Basics...), a logarithmic function is the obvious choice as a fit function. Furthermore, the depending argument consists of a product of two solar wind parameters which individually scale logarithmically with  $K_p$ . These reasons are why we use the logarithm of a parabola for the fitting approach:

$$f(x) = \ln(x^2). \quad (4.4)$$

We introduce a horizontal shifting parameter  $x_2$  because the distribution's center is slightly offset. To be able



**Figure 4.10** Mean  $K_p$  values (+) and MAD values (dotted) per  $vB_z$  interval. The error bars represent the relative data count. The logarithmic fit (dashed) is plotted with a mean MAD band (shaded area). The splitted function (4.5) is used for the weighted fit. OMNI data from the time period 1981–2016 is used.

to replicate the asymmetry in both arms, we split the fit function into a negative and a positive part:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} f_-(x) & \text{for } x < 0, \\ f_+(x) & \text{for } x \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

This way both arms can be scaled individually with the scaling factors for the negative and positive parts  $a$  and  $c$ . The resulting logarithmic fit functions are

$$f_-(x) = a \cdot \ln((x + x_2)^2 + d) + b, \quad (4.6)$$

$$f_+(x) = c \cdot (f_-(x) - f_-(-x_2)) + f_-(-x_2), \quad (4.7)$$

with the vertical shifting parameter  $b$  and the depth parameter  $d$ .

The resulting fit is plotted in Fig. 4.10 with the fit coefficients  $a = 1.258(19)$ ,  $b = -17.04(33)$ ,  $c = 0.467(20)$ ,  $d = 1.416(68) \times 10^6$  and  $x_2 = 163(20)$  for units of [ $\text{km s}^{-1} \text{nT}$ ].

Thus, the solar wind dependency relation condenses to:

$$Kp_-(vB_z) = 1.26 \cdot \ln((vB_z + 160)^2 + 1.42 \times 10^6) - 17.0, \quad (4.8)$$


$$Kp_+(vB_z) = 0.47 \cdot (Kp_-(vB_z) - Kp_-(-160)) + Kp_-(-160). \quad (4.9)$$

This relation can be used together with real-time in situ measurements from spacecraft located at L1 to nowcast the actual  $K_p$  index.

## 4.4 $K_p$ forecast from remote CME observations

Compared to the steady solar wind, which can be measured reliably only from in situ measurements, CMEs can already be sighted raising from their source region on the solar surface. From remote coronagraph observations some CME properties can be estimated and modeled to Earth, like its propagation direction and its arrival time and velocity (cites...). Thus, early observations enable a heads-up time only depending on the CME's propagation speed to Earth. This travel duration can be more than 4 days for slow events with average solar wind speeds, about 40 hours for fast events with average speeds of  $1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and down to 20 hours and even below for the rare extreme cases, e.g., 19 hours for the event observed by Carrington (1859) on 1 September 1859 and about 21 hours for the event on 23 July 2012 (Russell et al. 2013; Temmer & Nitta 2015).

To make use of the heads-up time for CMEs, we simplify the coupling relation from before (4.3) by neglecting its magnetic field part, which cannot be determined from remote observations. Only the solar wind velocity is left as a coupling parameter.



**Figure 4.11** Solar wind velocity frequency distributions for 3-hour mean (black), maximum (red) and maximum of the CME part (green). Minutely OMNI data from the period 1981–2016 is used.

#### 4.4.1 CME velocity estimation

methods and modeling...?

GCS, CAD modeling -> propagation direction and apex height-time profile -> acceleration and velocity kinematics...

-> example event CME?

#### 4.4.2 SWS CME list

For the following analysis we use the list of solar wind structures (SWS) created and updated by Richardson et al. (2000); Richardson & Cane (2012), who characterized the near-Earth solar wind structures since 1963. All periods related to ICMEs in the OMNI solar wind data set were identified and flagged.

The SWS list for 1963–2016 was kindly provided by Ian Richardson (private communication).

SWS list for 1963–2015 by (Richardson et al. 2000; Richardson & Cane 2012) is available via registration at CEDARweb<sup>6</sup>.

List of near-Earth ICMEs since January 1996 by Cane & Richardson (2003); Richardson & Cane (2010). Available as ACE Level 3 data for the period 1995–mid2016<sup>7</sup>.

The CME fraction of the OMNI time series for the period 1981–2016 is 15.8 % (5.53 years) and that for the period 1963–2016 is 17.0 % (9.01 years).

#### 4.4.3 Data processing and correlation


Again we calculate 3-hour extreme values using the minutely OMNI data to profit from higher correlation coefficients, like done for the data processing of the  $vB_z$  analysis in Sect. 4.3.2. For the velocity these are 3-hour maximum values. The comparison between the 3-hour maximum and the 3-hour mean frequency distributions show that their mean position raises from 405 to 425 km s<sup>-1</sup>, see Fig. 4.11.

Using the CME periods from the SWS list as a filter, the CME part and non-CME part of the data can be examined separately. Their frequency distributions show that in faster solar wind the CME share is rising until eventually in the region above about 900 km s<sup>-1</sup> there exist only CMEs, see Fig. 4.11.

The CME part of the data is correlated with the  $K_p$  index independently from the remaining solar wind, see Fig. 4.12. The correlation for CME related data is smaller than that for the regular solar wind. Its maximal correlation coefficient with a value of 0.51 is without time shift, see Table 4.1. The regular solar wind without CMEs shows a higher correlation with  $K_p$  and its maximal coefficient of 0.66 is at a positive time shift of 9 hours, that is, the  $K_p$  index forecasts the velocity of regular solar wind 9 hours in advance.

<sup>6</sup>CEDARweb website for Solar Wind Structures: [http://cedarweb.vsp.ucar.edu/wiki/index.php/Tools\\_and\\_Models:Solar\\_Wind\\_Structures](http://cedarweb.vsp.ucar.edu/wiki/index.php/Tools_and_Models:Solar_Wind_Structures) (existent in 2017-10-29)

<sup>7</sup>ACE Level 3 data website – list of near-Earth ICMEs: <http://www.srl.caltech.edu/ACE/ASC/DATA/level3/icmetable2.htm> (existent in 2017-10-29)



**Figure 4.12**  $Kp$ -velocity correlation coefficients for different time shifts. The correlations for the whole solar wind data (solid), for solar wind without CMEs (dashed) and for CMEs only (dotted) are plotted. The used data is the 3hour maximum of the minutely high resolution OMNI data.

**Table 4.1** Time lags with the highest correlation coefficients for the  $Kp$ -velocity relation. The used data is the 3hour maximum of the minutely high resolution OMNI data.

| Data     | Time lag [hours] | Correlation coefficient |
|----------|------------------|-------------------------|
| All data | 6                | 0.622                   |
| w/o CMEs | 9                | 0.661                   |
| CMEs     | 0                | 0.511                   |

The positive time shift can be explained with the occurrence of interaction regions followed by high speed streams (HSS). When a slow solar wind stream is followed by a fast one, the compression at their interface leads to enhanced solar wind densities and magnetic field strengths. The peak velocity of a HSS naturally appears after the interaction region. Therefore the  $Kp$  impact of the enhanced magnetic field is correlated with the higher velocity of the HSS, yielding the observed positive time shift.

#### 4.4.4 Functional dependency for CMEs

The general  $Kp$ -velocity dependency is apparent in the tilt of its distribution, see top panel of Fig. 4.13. The comparison with the CME data shows that  $Kp$  values  $> 7$  and velocities  $> 900 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  are almost always associated with CME related periods, see middle and bottom panel of Fig. 4.13.

To find a functional dependency for the mean  $Kp$  value we look at the relative frequencies per velocity interval, which are plotted in the bottom panel of Fig. 4.14. The mean  $Kp$  value seems to scale almost linear with the solar wind velocity. The mean absolute deviation of the mean has a mean size of about 1.1  $Kp$  units.

Again, as the  $Kp$  index has a quasi-logarithmic scaling, a logarithmic function is the obvious choice for the fitting process, for which thus the logarithmic function

$$f(x) = a \cdot \ln(x + x_1) + b \quad (4.10)$$

is used, with the scaling factor  $a$ , the location parameter  $x_1$  and the vertical shifting parameter  $b$ .

The resulting fit is plotted in Fig. 4.15, with velocity in units of  $[\text{km s}^{-1}]$  its parameters are  $a = 10.6(34)$ ,  $b = -73(28)$  and  $x_1 = 8.1(43) \times 10^2$ .


This leads to the CME dependency function

$$Kp(v) = 11 \cdot \ln(v + 800) - 70, \quad (4.11)$$


which can be used to forecast the  $Kp$  index from the estimated CME arrival velocity.

#### 4.4.5 Functional dependency for non-CMEs


use of by 9hours shifted data..., see Fig. 4.12




**Figure 4.13**  $Kp$ -velocity distributions for the whole solar wind data, for solar wind without CMEs and for CMEs only. The used data is the 3hour maximum of the minutely high resolution OMNI data. For the CME separation the SWS list from Richardson & Cane (2012) is used. The bin size is  $10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and  $1/3 Kp$  unit respectively.



**Figure 4.14** CME part of the  $Kp$ -velocity distribution (same as third panel of Fig. 4.13) and its relative distribution per velocity interval with the mean  $Kp$  values (solid) and their mean absolute deviation (dotted). The bin size is  $10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and  $1/3 Kp$  unit respectively.



**Figure 4.15** Mean  $K_p$  values (+) and MAD values (dotted) per velocity interval for the CME part of the data. The error bars represent the relative data count. The logarithmic fit (dashed) is plotted with a mean MAD band (shaded area). The function (4.10) is used for the weighted fit. The CME part of the OMNI data from the period 1981–2016 is obtained using the SWS list from Richardson & Cane (2012).



**Figure 4.16** Non-CME part of the  $K_p$ -velocity distribution (similar to second panel of Fig. 4.13, but with the by 9 hours shifted data) and its relative distribution per velocity interval with the mean  $K_p$  values (solid) and their mean absolute deviation (dotted). The bin size is  $10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and  $1/3 K_p$  unit respectively.

To find a functional dependency for the mean  $K_p$  value we look at the relative frequencies per velocity interval, which are plotted in the bottom panel of Fig. 4.16. The mean  $K_p$  value seems to scale almost linear with the solar wind velocity. The mean absolute deviation of the mean has a mean size of about 0.7  $K_p$  units.

Again, as the  $K_p$  index has a quasi-logarithmic scaling, a logarithmic function is the obvious choice for the fitting process, for which thus the logarithmic function (4.10) is used.

The resulting fit is plotted in Fig. 4.17 and the fit parameters are  $a = 5.88(38)$ ,  $b = -3.70(29) \times 10^1$  and  $x_1 = 2.99(49) \times 10^2$ , with velocity in units of [ $\text{km s}^{-1}$ ].

This leads to the non-CME dependency function

$$K_p(v) = 5.9 \cdot \ln(v + 300) - 37, \quad (4.12)$$

which can be used to forecast the  $K_p$  index from the estimated velocity coming from coronal hole analysis.

## 4.5 Results and discussion


solar activity:  $K_p$ -ssn relation

seasonal changes:  $K_p$ -month relation

solar wind nowcast:  $K_p$ - $vB_z$  relation (average and worst case)

CME forecast:  $K_p$ -velocity relation (average and worst case)

non-CME forecast:  $K_p$ -velocity relation (average and worst case)



**Figure 4.17** Mean  $K_p$  values (+) and MAD values (dotted) per velocity interval for the non-CME part of the data, shifted by 9 hours. The error bars represent the relative data count. The logarithmic fit (dashed) is plotted with a mean MAD band (shaded area). The function (4.10) is used for the weighted fit. The non-CME part of the OMNI data from the period 1981–2016 is obtained using the SWS list from Richardson & Cane (2012).

*Kp-velocity correlation*  
similar to Elliott et al. (2013); different data time period, resolution and averaging method (3-hour maximum of 1 min data)

## 4.6 Conclusions

### 4.7 Outlook

Applications:

$K_p$ -rssfeed, realtime solar wind and  $K_p$  plot

CME  $K_p$  impact (part of UGOE DDC)

give URLs...

## 4.8 Acknowledgments

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under the grant agreement number 263506 (AFFECTS).

The authors thank the Helios and OMNI PIs/teams for creating and making available the solar wind in situ data. The OMNI data are supplied by the NASA Space Science Data Coordinated Archive (NSSDCA) and the Space Physics Data Facility (SPDF) at NASA’s Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC).

Additional thanks for maintaining and providing the international sunspot number series goes to the World Data Center – Sunspot Index and Long-term Solar Observations (WDC-SILSO) at the Solar Influences Data Analysis Center (SIDC), Royal Observatory of Belgium (ROB).

The hourly solar wind structure list was kindly provided by Ian Richardson of the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center and CRESST/University of Maryland via the CEDAR Database at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, which is supported by the National Science Foundation.

The results presented in this paper rely on the  $K_p$  index, calculated and made available by the German Research Centre for Geosciences in Potsdam from data collected at magnetic observatories. We thank the involved national institutes, the INTERMAGNET network and ISGI ([isgi.unistra.fr](http://isgi.unistra.fr)).



## 5 chapter2

Alle Presis ausschlachten!  
Alle Projektberichte ausschlachten!  
Kp8–Liste irgendwo einweben...  
paper draft 2014 ausschlachten... Check!

-> example events CIR/HSS and CME

literature:

SWS: Rules of the Road: Please contact Ian Richardson about your use of this data.  
V-Kp correlation similar to [Elliott et al. \(2013\)](#); different data resolution and averaging method (3-hour maximum of 1 min data)  
linear velocity replacement of ACE realtime data with Kp, Machol2013

### 5.1 Solar wind interaction processes with the magnetosphere

there are several underlying physical mechanisms, whose contribution is not yet quantified'?'  
physical mechanisms:

- reconnection
- compression
- turbulence
- induction?

three ways for solar wind momentum and energy transfer into magnetosphere:

- sw entering sphere
- waves/eddies
- reconnection

### 5.2 Solar wind–magnetosphere coupling functions

coupling mechanisms and therefrom derived functions  
VBzgsm - E-field...

Studies finding best coupling function, Newell, etc.

[Newell et al. \(2007\)](#): universal sw-magnetosphere coupling function (opening flux rate)  
[Newell et al. \(2008\)](#): coupling function merging and viscous term  
merging and viscous terms (reconnection and turbulence)  
merging term: rate magnetic flux is opened at the magnetopause ( $d\Phi_{MP}/dt$ )  
viscous term: reconnection due to Kelvin-Helmholtz instabilities at the boundary ( $n^{1/2}v^2$ )  
equation for the least variance linear prediction of Kp:  $Kp = 0.05 + 2.244 \times 10^{-4}d\Phi_{MP}/dt + 2.844 \times 10^{-6}n^{1/2}v^2$   
combination of both terms works best ( $r = 0.866$ )

see also subsection 2.8.4

### 5.3 Parameter selection

In our analyses we use the planetary geomagnetic disturbance indicator Kp (see Section XX...), because it is designed to measure solar particle radiation by its magnetic effects (cite? Bartels...?). and has close relation to aurorae, NOAA scale

correlation coefficients in [Table 5.1](#).

**Table 5.1** Pearson correlation coefficients of Kp with solar wind parameters... (use Spearman instead?)

| Parameter | OMNI 1min              |             |
|-----------|------------------------|-------------|
|           | 19850101-20150101      | 3h 1min max |
| N         | 0.199792               |             |
| V         | 0.598351               |             |
| T         | 0.510607               |             |
| B         | 0.595860               |             |
| Bzgsm     | -0.666050 <sup>a</sup> |             |
| V*B       | 0.682383               |             |
| V*Bzgsm   | -0.715101 <sup>a</sup> |             |
| N*T       |                        |             |

<sup>a</sup>Here it is min instead of max.

### 5.4 Data selection

choosing data time range

the Kp time series started in XXXX, when there were no spacecraft to measure in situ solar wind → time range defined by available solar wind data

OMNI data set -> longest continuous solar wind data set

### 5.5 Solar cycle influence

solar cycle dependence

- parameter time plots
- parameter vs SSN matrix-plots
- cc time plots
- cc vs SSN plots

### 5.6 CME correlations

same analysis for CMEs

- parameter time plots
- parameter vs SSN matrix-plots
- cc time plots
- cc vs SSN plots

### 5.7 Solar wind structure analyses

How strong do different structure types influence the terrestrial magnetosphere?

What kind of solar wind structures create the individual regions in this distribution?

What is their individual contribution to the Kp ranges (e.g. high Kp: CMEs 70% and CIRs 30%)?

ACE solar wind time series and event list  
sw-timeseries ACE OPTIMAP “Zeitreihe”-events  
method: automatic list creation by event detection via parameter thresholds...

sample CME analyses (MVA, -> Kp)

(How can the impact field strength of CMEs be forecasted (V->B correlation for CMEs)?)

## 5.8 Forecast

Internal solar wind correlations:  
B-V correlation  
ACE MAGSWE 64 s data -> yearly overlay plot

applications:  
rssfeeds, rtsw plots  
CME Kp impact as part of DDC  
-  $Kp$  nowcast with L1 solar wind measurements (L1 alerts, disseminated as RSS feeds; integrated in smartphone app and space weather display)  
- Forecast of the possible CME impact on the Earth's magnetosphere ( $Kp$  index) from the predicted CME arrival velocity (integrated in UGOE CME forecast chain (aka DDC))

seasonal correction:  $\Delta Kp(\text{month})$   
 $Kp_{\text{impact}} = Kp_{\text{CME}} \pm \Delta Kp(\text{month})$



# 6 PaperMVVB

## 6.1 Literature

Schwenn1983 intro -> sw-averaging comment (beer and wine)

see Hellinger2013 p.1353

see astro70/CGAUSS/dropbox\_presis/... (presi 1.07 Inside Helios-Origins and Evolution-Salem.ppt -> Helios reloaded; radial functions for all parameters)

see Balogh1999 from p. 162 (Helios CIR results)

see Marsch1999... (model constraints)

model boundary condition: continuity of mass flux

On solar wind acceleration and SPP proposition: McComas2007

Parker1963 book, p. 75 -> isothermal expansion figure


Motivational question: What is the evolution of the solar wind parameters/structures before arriving at Earth?  
what is meant by the term evolution?

## 6.2 Seasonal solar wind variations

seasonal variation by month

quantify variation amplitudes

see [Figure 6.1](#)



**Figure 6.1** Diagram of the velocity frequency by month for the period 1963/01–2013/08. Mean and median values are shown as well.

see [Figure 6.2](#)

derived exponent values from simple trigonometric fit on monthly values:

$$c_N = -2.234$$

maybe figure?

expected influence from Earth's perihelion/aphelion (see Appendix...) distance vs observations  
we expect for the proton density (scaling law  $N(r) = 7.6 \text{ cm}^{-3} \cdot r^{-2}$ ):

$$N(0.983 \text{ au}) = 7.9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$$


$$N(1 \text{ au}) = 7.6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$$

$$N(1.017 \text{ au}) = 7.3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$$

we expect for the magnetic field strength (scaling law  $\propto r^{-1.6}$ ):

$$B(0.983 \text{ au}) = 6.3 \text{ nT}$$

$$B(1 \text{ au}) = 6.1 \text{ nT}$$



**Figure 6.2** Diagram of magnetic field frequency by month for the period 1963/01–2013/08. Mean and median values are shown as well as the expected course from the solar distance variation (obtained from Helios data).

$$B(1.017 \text{ au}) = 5.9 \text{ nT}$$

### 6.3 Latitude dependency

refer to Ulysses [Figure 2.11](#)


Ulysses swoops polar plots...

see Schwenn1990's Fig. 3.14

see also [Schwenn \(1990\)](#) p. 127

see also [Richardson et al. \(1995\)](#)

latitude; see [Figure 6.3](#)



**Figure 6.3** The four solar wind parameter's HGI latitude dependency. Their mean values per  $0.1^\circ$  bin are plotted as well. make figure same dimensions as projected figure in analysis part...


with the exponential dependencies to 1 au projected solar wind parameters; there are only small changes with latitude in the range  $-7.25^\circ$ – $7.25^\circ$

have a look on distribution widths...

dependence from latitude in interval  $-7.25^\circ$ – $7.25^\circ$  in Helios data negligible?, see [Figure 6.4](#). estimate error ranges...

...plot Ulysses data into plot?

influence from latitude variation in data negligible? (see Ulysses [Figure 2.11](#) in introduction). Helios probes within ecliptic => variation span equal to solar tilt:  $-7.25^\circ$  to  $7.25^\circ$ ; solar tilt/obliquity to ecliptic:  $i_\odot = 7.25^\circ$  (Sun fact sheet: <http://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/planetary/factsheet/sunfact.html>)  
big part of Helios data is from latitudes  $> \pm 5^\circ$ , see Figure XX (data count over latitude) and see [Figure 3.8](#)



**Figure 6.4** Plot of the to 1 au projected solar wind parameters over latitude. And their mean values, including weighted fit. add projected median...

(Helios orbit polar plane in data section)

## 6.4 Radial evolution of solar wind structures

Helios event lists HSSs, SLOWs, CIRs, CMEs...; event lists for all Helios data see Liu2004 for Helios ICME list and radial dependencies of  $B$ ,  $n$ ,  $T$  and  $v$ ...

200 km s<sup>-1</sup> slow solar wind at 10  $R_{\odot}$  is in agreement with blob measurements from Wang2000

very slow sw (VSSW) gets accelerated; see Sanchez-Diaz2016:

radial diameter of MCs increase between 0.3 au and 4.3 au proportional to the distance as  $r^{0.8}$  (Bothmer & Schwenn 1998)

MC central axial magnetic field strength radial density dependence  $B = 18.1 r^{-1.64}$  Leitner et al. (2007)

MC average diameter  $D = 0.23 r^{1.14}$  Leitner et al. (2007)

sw structure marked plots

structure extrapolations

## 6.5 Solar distance dependency—theory

B-field radial profile:  $B \propto r^{-1.5?}$

Magnetic field magnitude model (Kivelson 1995):

$$Br(r) = B_0 / r^2$$

Bphi(r) = -B0 omega / (Vr \* r) (shear effect from solar rotation omega)

$$B_{\theta}(r) = 0$$

$$B(r) = (Br^2 + Bphi^2 + B_{\theta}^2)^{1/2}$$

$B(r) = \sqrt{(B_0 / r^2)^2 + (-B_0 \omega / (Vr * r))^2} \rightarrow$  expected r dependency:  $B \propto r^{-1.5}$   
see also [radial\\_fit\\_B\\_test\\_plot.png](#)

Parker references

velocity radial profile:  $V \propto r^0?$

model based on LeBlanc1998 electron density with flux conservation: Zic2015(Temmer)

density radial profile:  $N \propto r^{-2}$

simple view: for a spherical constant velocity mass outflow a one over distance squared law is expected, because of the mass flux conservation per solid angle for different distances. measurements up to the outer heliosphere confirm the  $1/r^2$  dependency (1–38 au by Voyager 2, (Belcher et al. 1993) newer paper?)

## 6. PaperMVVB

---

in an ideal neutral plasma the electron and proton number density have the same values (neutral plasma) (reference?)

ca. 10 % more electrons than protons (due to alphas) cite?


temperature radial profile:  $T \propto r^{-1}$ ?

at larger distances heating outbalances the adiabatic temperature part (adiabatic cooling vs. pickup proton and stream-interaction heating; 1–68 au by Voyager 2; [Richardson & Smith \(2003\)](#))

solar wind ram pressure  $p_{\text{ram}} = \rho V^2$

### 6.5.1 change B-field radial dependency...

$B(r) = \sqrt{((B_0 / r^2)^2 + (-B_0 \omega / (V_r * r))^2} \rightarrow$  expected  $r$  dependency:  $B \propto r^{-2} + b * r^{-1}$   
fit with  $\sqrt{(r^a)^2 + (r^b)^2}$ , where  $a \approx -2$  and  $b \approx -1$



**Figure 6.5** Plot of the magnetic field strength's frequency distribution at different solar distances (0.29, 0.52, 0.75 and 0.98 au). The Helios data, the composed fit model and both its components are plotted. 0.23 au steps, lw 2, stepfunction

=> what kind of distribution has the B-field near the Sun?

## 6.6 flux conservation

conserved quantities:

- momentum conservation... VBbookp112
- flux conservation...

With consideration of continuity the mass flux per solid angle has to be constant:  $\dot{m} = \text{const}$   
conserved quantities:

- mass flux:  $\dot{m} = \rho v A$  (with mass density  $\rho$ , velocity  $v$  and [cross-sectional area  $A$ ] or solid angle?...)
- particle fluxes (proton flux, electron flux, etc.)
- proton flux:  $j_p = n_p v_p A$  (with proton density  $n_p$  and proton velocity  $v_p$ )

(with proton mass density  $\rho = n_p m_p$  (with proton number density  $n_p$  and proton mass  $m_p$ )).

the individual radial dependencies for a spherical radial outflow are:

$$A(r) \propto r^2 \rightarrow A/r^2 = \text{const}$$

and assuming an exponential dependency,

$$n_p(r) = n_0 r^{c_n},$$

$$v(r) = v_0 r^{c_v}$$

$$j_p = \text{const} \quad (6.1)$$

$$n_p v_p A = \text{const} \quad (6.2)$$

$$n_0 r^{c_n} v_0 r^{c_v} r^2 = \text{const} \quad (6.3)$$

$$r^{c_n} r^{c_v} r^2 = \text{const} \quad (6.4)$$

$$\Rightarrow c_n + c_v + 2 = 0 \quad (6.5)$$

$$c_n + c_v = -2 \quad (6.6)$$

an increasing velocity should result in a steeper density...

validity of mass flux continuity: within the heliosphere mass to energy conversion and vice versa is negligible, but there can be flux from and to higher latitudes as the Helios data is localized to a small latitude range in the ecliptic plane.

estimate the error from that... (if error is too big => drop continuity condition)

larger errors should be located near CMEs and CIRs (nonradial flows from interactions)

there is a proton flux difference between slow and fast solar wind streams (see book Schwenn 1990 p. 146)

estimate the possible size of error:

mean:

$$c_n = -2.010$$

$$c_v = 0.049$$

$$c_n + c_v = -1.961$$

difference to -2 is 0.039

## 6.7 sw parameters and precision

definition of 'the four solar wind parameters':

magnetic field strength, aka magnetic field,  $B$ , usually measured in nT, in the order of 0–35 nT at 1 au

proton bulk velocity, aka velocity,  $v$ , usually measured in km/s, in the order of 200–900 km/s at 1 au

proton number density, aka density,  $n$ , usually measured in  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ , in the order of 1–60 at 1 au

proton temperature, aka temperature,  $T$ , usually measured in K, in the order of 10 000–1 000 000 K at 1 au

sentence about ordering of the parameters...

hourly OMNI data

measurement precision:

$B$ : 0.01 nT

$v$ : 1 km/s

$n$ : 0.1  $\text{cm}^{-3}$

$T$ : 1 K ? (smallest found: 7 K)

error discussion:

OMNI hourly data mean:

$B$ : bin size 0.5 nT, median 5.6, mean 6.30056(18)

$v$ : bin size 10 km/s, median 414, mean 437.6700(18)

$n$ : bin size 1  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ , median 5.3, mean 6.831410(18)

$T$ : bin size 10 000 K, median 80 751, mean 112 219.0(19) (with 1000 K as precision)

empirical data; Helios; hourly

why hourly and not higher resolution data?

measurement precision:

$B$ : 0.01 nT

$v$ : 0.1 km/s

$n$ : 0.1  $\text{cm}^{-3}$

$T$ : 100–1000 K (3 digits)

$r$ : 0.01 au

## 6. PaperMVVB

---

error discussion:

Helios hourly data mean:

$B$ : min 337, precision: 0.000545; 18.3x better

$v$ : min 497, precision: 0.00449; 22.2x

$n$ : min 497, precision: 0.00449; 22.2x

$T$ : min 497, precision: 4.49–44.49 22.2x

=> so we use 1/10 the measurement precision for the mean.

median precision same as data precision

Helios histogram bin size for mean of frequency distribution (at specific solar distance)

$B$ : bin size 0.5 nT, min 337, mean precision: 0.000545

$v$ : bin size 1 cm<sup>-3</sup>, min 497, mean precision: 0.00449

$n$ : bin size 10 km/s, min 497, mean precision: 0.00449

$T$ : bin size 10 000 K, min 497, mean precision: 4.49–44.49

## 6.8 other

McGregor2011 analyzed the empirical magnetic topology–velocity relationship, using Helios perihelion data with the Wang-Sheeley-Arge (WSA) coronal model, and found indications, that the fast and slow solar wind are generated from distinct sources. (not only superradial expansion)

Concerning the error notation I adhere to the parentheses notation documented in the “Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement” (GUM) published by [Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology \(2008\)](#), where the numbers in parentheses are the errors on the corresponding last digits of the quoted value.

For more on lognormal distributions see appendix [section B.2](#)


we get the ultimate monster equation:

$$W_{II}(x, \tilde{a}_1, \tilde{b}_1, \bar{a}_1, \bar{b}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \tilde{b}_2, \bar{a}_2, \bar{b}_2) = \quad (6.7)$$

$$\frac{c}{2 \sqrt{\pi \ln\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_1 r^{\tilde{b}_1}}{\bar{a}_1 r^{\bar{b}_1}}\right)} x} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln^2\left(\frac{x}{\tilde{a}_1 r^{\tilde{b}_1}}\right)}{4 \ln\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_1 r^{\tilde{b}_1}}{\bar{a}_1 r^{\bar{b}_1}}\right)}\right) + \frac{(1 - c)}{2 \sqrt{\pi \ln\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_2 r^{\tilde{b}_2}}{\bar{a}_2 r^{\bar{b}_2}}\right)} x} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln^2\left(\frac{x}{\tilde{a}_2 r^{\tilde{b}_2}}\right)}{4 \ln\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_2 r^{\tilde{b}_2}}{\bar{a}_2 r^{\bar{b}_2}}\right)}\right) \quad (6.8)$$

The extrapolation distance is only about one third of the model range, but as the parameters follow exponential change, one has to look at the logarithmic distance which is indeed one and a half times the model range.

argument with gravitational deceleration; near-Sun extrapolation should be biased, because in the near-Sun region gravitation becomes significant (see [Figure 6.6](#))



**Figure 6.6** velocity over solar distance; gravitational deceleration. place instead figure of grav. force over solar distance...

comparison...

...with Vourlidas estimates at 10  $R_\odot$

---

...with Wang2000 slow blobs

## 6.9 Paper...

paper introduction and context of motivation in thesis and context of results in thesis

coauthor is Volker Bothmer

The major part of this chapter is published in citetVenzmer2017. This paper is included following this chapter.  
not yet reproduced with permission © ESO.

copyright/published in Astronomy and Astrophysics

The described analyses were entirely done by me, as well as the tables, figures and equations. My coauthor worked together with me on the text and the anonymous referee helped clarifying the descriptions of a few aspects. The text was further improved by the A&A language editor Joshua Neve.

my own contributions to the paper (percentages):

data analyses 100

tables 100

figures 100

formulas 100

section structure 80

text 55

- abstract 70

- introduction 30

- frequency distributions 65

- solar activity dependence 70

- solar distance dependency 60

- empirical solar wind model 75

- model extrapolation 35

- discussion and summary 20

replace paper with actual published A&A version...



# Solar-wind predictions for the Parker Solar Probe orbit

## Near-Sun extrapolations derived from an empirical solar-wind model based on Helios and OMNI observations

M. S. Venzmer and V. Bothmer

University of Goettingen, Institute for Astrophysics, Friedrich-Hund-Platz 1, 37077 Göttingen, Germany

Received 25 August 2017; accepted 10 November 2017

### ABSTRACT

**Context.** The Parker Solar Probe (PSP) (formerly Solar Probe Plus) mission will be humanity's first in situ exploration of the solar corona with closest perihelia at 9.86 solar radii ( $R_\odot$ ) distance to the Sun. It will help answer hitherto unresolved questions on the heating of the solar corona and the source and acceleration of the solar wind and solar energetic particles. The scope of this study is to model the solar-wind environment for PSP's unprecedented distances in its prime mission phase during the years 2018–2025. The study is performed within the Coronagraphic German And US SolarProbePlus Survey (CGAUSS) which is the German contribution to the PSP mission as part of the Wide-field Imager for Solar PRobe (WISPR).

**Aims.** We present an empirical solar-wind model for the inner heliosphere which is derived from OMNI and Helios data. The German-US space probes Helios 1 and Helios 2 flew in the 1970s and observed solar wind in the ecliptic within heliocentric distances of 0.29–0.98 au. The OMNI database consists of multi-spacecraft intercalibrated in situ data obtained near 1 au over more than five solar cycles. The international sunspot number (SSN) and its predictions are used to derive dependencies of the major solar-wind parameters on solar activity and to forecast their properties for the PSP mission.

**Methods.** The frequency distributions for the solar-wind key parameters, magnetic field strength, proton velocity, density, and temperature, are represented by lognormal functions. In addition, we consider the velocity distribution's bi-componental shape, consisting of a slower and a faster part. Functional relations to solar activity are compiled with use of the OMNI data by correlating and fitting the frequency distributions with the SSN. Further, based on the combined data set from both Helios probes, the parameters' frequency distributions are fitted with respect to solar distance to obtain power law dependencies. Thus an empirical solar-wind model for the inner heliosphere confined to the ecliptic region is derived, accounting for solar activity and for solar distance through adequate shifts of the lognormal distributions. Finally, the inclusion of SSN predictions and the extrapolation down to PSP's perihelion region enables us to estimate the solar-wind environment for PSP's planned trajectory during its mission duration.

**Results.** The CGAUSS empirical solar-wind model for PSP yields dependencies on solar activity and solar distance for the solar-wind parameters' frequency distributions. The estimated solar-wind median values for PSP's first perihelion in 2018 at a solar distance of 0.16 au are 87 nT, 340 km s<sup>-1</sup>, 214 cm<sup>-3</sup> and 503 000 K. The estimates for PSP's first closest perihelion, occurring in 2024 at 0.046 au (9.86  $R_\odot$ ), are 943 nT, 290 km s<sup>-1</sup>, 2951 cm<sup>-3</sup>, and 1 930 000 K. Since the modeled velocity and temperature values below approximately 20  $R_\odot$  appear overestimated in comparison with existing observations, this suggests that PSP will directly measure solar-wind acceleration and heating processes below 20  $R_\odot$  as planned.

**Key words.** solar wind – sun: heliosphere – sun: corona

### 1. Introduction

From observations of cometary tail fluctuations, Biermann (1951) inferred the presence of a continuous flow of particles from the Sun. With his theoretical solar-wind model, Parker (1958) formulated the existence of the solar wind even before the first satellites measured it in situ in 1959 (Gringauz et al. 1960; Neugebauer & Snyder 1966). The idea of a space mission flying through the solar corona dates back to the founding year of NASA in 1958 (McComas et al. 2008). Since then several space missions have measured the solar wind in situ at a wide range of heliocentric distances. In the case of Voyager 1, this was as far away as 140 au<sup>1</sup> in October 2017, having crossed the heliopause into interstellar space at a distance of 121 au (Gurnett et al. 2013). Various spacecraft have provided a wealth of solar-wind measurements near Earth's orbit, with WIND (Leping et al. 1995; Ogilvie et al. 1995), SOHO (Domingo et al.

1995), ACE (Stone et al. 1998) and DSCOVR (Burt & Smith 2012) currently providing observations while orbiting around the L1 point 1.5 million km ahead of Earth in the sunward direction. Additional measurements at other solar distances were provided by planetary missions to Venus and Mercury, such as PVO (Colin 1980) or MESSENGER (Belcher et al. 1991). Ulysses was the first probe that orbited the Sun out of the ecliptic plane and thus could measure solar wind even at polar latitudes (McComas et al. 1998). The in situ solar-wind measurements closest to the Sun to date were made by the Helios missions. Helios 1, launched in 1974, reached distances of 0.31 au. Helios 2, launched two years later, approached the Sun as close as 0.29 au (Rosenbauer et al. 1977). The NASA Parker Solar Probe<sup>2</sup> (PSP), formerly Solar Probe Plus, six years after its planned launch date in mid 2018, will reach its closest perihelia at a distance of 9.86 solar radii ( $R_\odot$ ), that is, 0.0459 au (Fox et al. 2015). This distance will

<sup>1</sup> <https://voyager.jpl.nasa.gov/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://parkersolarprobe.jhuapl.edu/>

be achieved through seven Venus gravity assists with orbital periods of 88–168 days. In its prime mission time 2018–2025 PSP provides 24 orbits with perihelia inside 0.25 au (Fox et al. 2015). Even its first perihelion, 93 days after launch in 2018, will take PSP to an unprecedented distance of 0.16 au ( $35.7 R_{\odot}$ ). In comparison, the ESA Solar Orbiter mission with a planned launch in February 2019 will have its closest perihelia at 0.28 au (Müller et al. 2013).

The key PSP science objectives are to “trace the flow of energy that heats and accelerates the solar corona and solar wind, determine the structure and dynamics of the plasma and magnetic fields at the sources of the solar wind, and explore mechanisms that accelerate and transport energetic particles” as stated in Fox et al. (2015). To achieve these goals, PSP has four scientific instruments on board: FIELDS for the measurement of magnetic fields and AC/DC electric fields (Bale et al. 2016), SWEAP for the measurement of flux of electrons, protons and alphas (Kasper et al. 2016), IS $\odot$ IS for the measurement of solar energetic particles (SEPs) (McComas et al. 2016) and WISPR for the measurement of coronal and inner heliospheric structures (Vourlidas et al. 2016).

The study presented in this paper is undertaken in the Coronagraphic German And US SolarProbePlus Survey (CGAUSS) project, which is the German contribution to the PSP mission as part of the Wide-field Imager for Solar PRobe (WISPR). WISPR will contribute to the PSP science goals by deriving the three-dimensional structure of the solar corona through which the in situ measurements are made to determine the sources of the solar wind. It will provide density power spectra over a wide range of structures (e.g., streamers, pseudostreamers and equatorial coronal holes) for determining the roles of turbulence, waves, and pressure-balanced structures in the solar wind. It will also measure the physical properties, such as speed and density jumps of SEP-producing shocks and their coronal mass ejection (CME) drivers as they evolve in the corona and inner heliosphere (Vourlidas et al. 2016). In order to help optimize the WISPR and PSP preplanning of the science operations, knowledge of the expected solar-wind environment is needed. For this purpose the solar-wind environment is extrapolated down to the closest perihelion of  $9.86 R_{\odot}$  distance to the Sun using in situ solar-wind data from the Helios probes and near 1 au data from various satellites compiled in the OMNI solar-wind database.

Generally, two types of solar wind are observed in the heliosphere – slow and fast streams (Neugebauer & Snyder 1966; Schwenn 1983). Slow solar wind has typical speeds of  $<400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and fast solar wind has speeds  $>600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (Schwenn 1990, p. 144). Their different compositions and characteristics indicate different sources and generation processes (McGregor et al. 2011b). Fast streams are found to originate from coronal holes as confirmed by Ulysses’ out-of-ecliptic measurements (McComas et al. 1998). The source of slow wind, and its eventually different types (Schwenn 1983), is still a subject of controversial discussions because several scenarios are possible to explain its origin from closed magnetic structures in the solar corona, such as intermittent reconnection at the top of helmet streamers and from coronal hole boundaries (Kilpua et al. 2016). The occurrence frequency of these slow and fast streams varies strongly with solar activity and their interactions lead to phenomena such as stream interaction regions which may persist for many solar rotations (“co-rotating” interaction regions) if the coronal source regions are quasi-stationary (Balogh et al. 1999). Embedded in the slow and fast solar-wind streams are transient flows of CMEs – the faster ones driving shock waves ahead (Gosling et al. 1974). Their rate follows the solar activity

cycle and varies in near 1 au measurements between only one CME every couple of days during solar cycle minima up to multiple CMEs observed over several days at times of solar maxima, that is, the CME-associated flow share of the solar wind raises from about 5 % up to about 50 % (Richardson & Cane 2012).

It is not known which specific solar-wind type or structure PSP will encounter at a given time during its mission, therefore we extrapolate the probability distributions of the major solar-wind parameters from existing solar-wind measurements and take solar cycle dependencies into account. As a baseline we describe the solar-wind environment through the key quantities of a magnetized plasma: magnetic field strength, density and temperature. Furthermore, the bulk flow velocity is the defining parameter of the two types of solar wind. Solar-wind quantities, like flux densities, mass flux, and plasma beta, can be directly derived from these four parameters. In the analyses, we treat the solar wind as a proton plasma – the average helium abundance is about 4.5 % and in slow wind at solar cycle minimum is even less than 2 % (Feldman et al. 1978; Schwenn 1983; Kasper et al. 2012).

Our approach is to obtain analytical representations of the shapes of the solar-wind parameter’s frequency distributions in Sect. 2, of their solar activity dependence in Sect. 3 and of their solar distance scaling in Sect. 4. The solar-wind parameters’ frequency distributions and solar activity dependence is derived from near-Earth solar wind and sunspot number (SSN) time series with a duration of almost five solar cycles. Their distance dependency is derived from Helios solar-wind measurements covering more than two thirds of the distance to the Sun and more than half a solar cycle. From a combination of the obtained frequency distributions, SSN dependence functions, and solar distance dependence functions, a general solar-wind model is built in Sect. 5, representing the solar activity and distance behavior. Finally, this empirical model is fed with SSN predictions and extrapolated to PSP’s planned orbital positions in Sect. 6.

## 2. Frequency distributions of the solar-wind parameters

The solar-wind parameters are highly variable due to short-term variations from structures such as slow and fast wind streams, interaction regions, and CMEs, whose rate and properties depend on the phase of the solar activity cycle. Hence, for deriving characteristic frequency distributions for the solar-wind parameters, measurements over long-term time spans are needed. The abundance of the near-Earth hourly OMNI data set is ideally suited for this purpose, because to date it spans almost five solar cycles.

The OMNI 2 data set (King & Papitashvili 2005) combines solar-wind magnetic field and plasma data collected by various satellites since 1963, currently by WIND and by ACE. This intercalibrated multi-spacecraft data is time-shifted to the nose of the Earth’s bow shock. The data is obtained from the OMNI-Web interface<sup>3</sup> at NASA’s Space Physics Data Facility (SPDF), Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC). In this study the whole hourly data until 31 December 2016 is used, starting from 27 November 1963 (for the temperature from 26 July 1965). The data coverage of the different parameters is in the range 67–74 %, corresponding to a total duration of 36–40 years. We note that a test-comparison of hourly averaged data with higher-time-resolution data for the available shorter time span 1981–2016 did not show significant differences in our results. According to the

<sup>3</sup> <http://omniweb.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

OMNI data precision and maximal parameter ranges we specify bin sizes of 0.5 nT for the magnetic field strength, 10 km s<sup>-1</sup> for the velocity, 1 cm<sup>-3</sup> for the density and 10 000 K for the temperature. The frequency distributions of the solar-wind magnetic field strength, proton velocity, density and temperature are shown in Fig. 1. The solar-wind magnetic field strength is in the range 0.4–62 nT, the velocity in the range 156–1189 km s<sup>-1</sup>, the density in the range 0–117 cm<sup>-3</sup>, the temperature in the range 3450–6.63 × 10<sup>6</sup> K, and the mean data values are at 6.28 nT, 436 km s<sup>-1</sup>, 6.8 cm<sup>-3</sup> and 1.05 × 10<sup>5</sup> K. These ranges and mean values are as statistically expected from previous analyses of near 1 au solar-wind data (e.g., Table 3.3 in Bothmer & Daglis (2007, p. 39)). Much higher or lower peak values at 1 au have been observed in extraordinary events, such as the 23 July 2012 CME with a speed of over 2000 km s<sup>-1</sup> and a peak field strength of about 100 nT that was observed by STEREO A (Russell et al. 2013), or the solar-wind disappearance event observed in May 1999 with density values even down to 0.2 cm<sup>-3</sup> (Lazarus 2000).

The frequency distributions of the solar-wind parameters, magnetic field strength, proton density, and temperature, can be well approximated by lognormal distributions, whereas the proton velocity's frequency has a differing shape, as shown in Veselovsky et al. (2010). We investigate how well all four solar-wind parameters' frequency distributions can be represented by lognormal functions, which we use in the process of a least squares regression fitting. The lognormal function,

$$W(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}x} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad (1)$$

depends on the location  $\mu$  and the shape parameter  $\sigma$ . Changes in  $\mu$  affect both the horizontal and vertical scaling of the function whereas  $\sigma$  influences its shape. The distribution's median  $x_{\text{med}}$  and mean  $x_{\text{avg}}$  (average) positions are easily interpreted and are directly calculated from  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ :

$$x_{\text{med}} = \exp(\mu) \quad \iff \quad \mu = \ln(x_{\text{med}}), \quad (2)$$


$$x_{\text{avg}} = \exp\left(\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) \quad \iff \quad \sigma = \sqrt{2 \ln\left(\frac{x_{\text{avg}}}{x_{\text{med}}}\right)}. \quad (3)$$

It is apparent that the mean is always larger than the median. Replacing the variables  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  with these relations, the lognormal function (1) becomes

$$W(x) = \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\pi \ln\left(\frac{x_{\text{avg}}}{x_{\text{med}}}\right)} x} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln^2\left(\frac{x}{x_{\text{med}}}\right)}{4 \ln\left(\frac{x_{\text{avg}}}{x_{\text{med}}}\right)}\right). \quad (4)$$

The values of  $x_{\text{med}}$  and  $x_{\text{avg}}$  obtained from fitting the individual solar-wind frequency distributions are listed in Table 1.

From visual inspection, the resulting fit curves describe the shape of the magnetic field strength, the density and the temperature distributions well, as can be seen in Fig. 1. However, for the velocity, the fit function appears not to be as good in describing the measured distribution's more complex shape around its peak and in the higher velocity range. This also can be inferred from the sum of absolute residuals (SAR) between data and fit, listed in Table 1 as a percentage of the distribution area, being almost three times larger than those from the other parameters. In order to find a better fit result for the velocity distribution, we assume that the velocity distribution can be made up of at least two overlapping branches (McGregor et al. 2011a). Therefore a



**Fig. 2.** Velocity frequency distribution (same as in Fig. 1) and its compositional lognormal fit. The fit's median and mean values and its two fit parts are indicated as well. The inset is a zoomed-in view of the high value tail of the distribution.

compositional approach is chosen by combining two lognormal functions (4), involving more fit variables:

$$W_{\text{II}}(x) = c \cdot W_1(x) + (1 - c) \cdot W_2(x). \quad (5)$$

The balancing parameter  $c$  ensures that the resulting function remains normalized as it represents a probability distribution. The fitting of  $W_{\text{II}}(x)$  to the velocity's frequency distribution yields the values of the now five fit parameters ( $c$ ,  $x_{\text{med},1}$ ,  $x_{\text{avg},1}$ ,  $x_{\text{med},2}$  and  $x_{\text{avg},2}$ ) as listed in Table 1 together with the median and mean values of the composed distribution, which can be derived by solving

$$\int W_{\text{II}}(x) dx = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int x W_{\text{II}}(x) dx = 0. \quad (6)$$

This more complex fit function is more accurate in describing the velocity's frequency distribution as shown in Fig. 2. Thus in the following Sections we keep the double lognormal ansatz for all velocity frequency fits.

For the bulk of the solar wind these static lognormal functions describe the parameters' distributions well. The abnormally high parameter values in the distribution functions can be attributed to shock/CME events in agreement with the results of the OMNI solar-wind investigations by Richardson & Cane (2012). The simple lognormal fit functions underestimate the frequencies in their high-value tails, except for the temperature's tail which is overestimated, as seen in the insets of Fig. 1. This appears to be because CMEs do not come with abnormally high temperatures, but rather with temperatures lower than those of the average solar wind (Forsyth et al. 2006). The velocity's compositional lognormal fit only slightly overestimates its tail as seen in the inset of Fig. 2. The slow and fast part contribute almost equally ( $c \approx 0.5$ ) to the long-term velocity distribution function.


### 3. Solar activity dependence of the solar-wind frequency distributions

In the next step we investigate how the long-term solar-wind distribution functions presented in the previous section depend on general solar activity. Therefore we examine their correlation with the SSN, being a commonly used long-term solar activity

**Table 1.** Resulting fit coefficients from the fitting of the lognormal function (4) to the shape of the solar-wind parameters' frequency distributions from near 1 au OMNI hourly data. For the velocity, the fit parameters of the double lognormal function (5) are also listed, as well as the median and mean values of the resulting velocity fit. The numbers in parentheses are the errors on the corresponding last digits of the quoted value. They are calculated from the estimated standard deviations of the fit parameters. For each parameter, the sum of absolute residuals between data and fit (in percentage of the distribution area) is also listed.

| Parameter                                | Median<br>$x_{\text{med}}$               | Mean<br>$x_{\text{avg}}$ | Balance<br>$c$ | SAR<br>[%] |
|--|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Magnetic field [nT]                      | 5.661(16)                                | 6.164(18)                | –              | 6.83       |
| Velocity [ $10^2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ]    | 4.085(19)                                | 4.183(20)                | –              | 18.69      |
| Density [ $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ]             | 5.276(24)                                | 6.484(34)                | –              | 6.48       |
| Temperature [ $10^4 \text{ K}$ ]         | 7.470(17)                                | 11.301(32)               | –              | 5.78       |
| Velocity<br>[ $10^2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ] | $W_1$<br>3.68(20)                        | 5.00(14)                 | 0.504(62)      | –          |
|  | $W_2$<br>4.16(14) <sup>a</sup>           | 3.72(20)                 | –              | –          |
|  | $W_{\text{II}}$<br>4.42(14) <sup>a</sup> | 4.42(14) <sup>a</sup>    | –              | 4.20       |

Notes. <sup>(a)</sup> Error estimates derived from the individual fit part errors.



**Fig. 1.** Frequency distributions of the four solar-wind parameters and their lognormal fits derived from the hourly OMNI data set. The histograms have bins of 0.5 nT, 10 km s<sup>-1</sup>, 1 cm<sup>-3</sup> and 10 000 K. The fits' median and mean values are indicated as well. The insets show zoomed-in views of the high-value tails of the distributions.


index, and determine the time lags with the highest correlation coefficients.

For the correlations we fit lognormal functions to the frequency distributions as in Sect. 2, but implement linear relations to the yearly SSN, allowing shifting of the distribution functions with SSN. For the velocity the approach is different insofar as its two components are kept fixed and instead their balance is modified with the changing SSN. Thus we obtain solar-activity-dependent models for the frequency distributions of all four solar-wind parameters.

The international sunspot number (1963–2016) is provided by the online catalog<sup>4</sup> at the World Data Center – Sunspot Index and Long-term Solar Observations (WDC-SILSO), Solar Influences Data Analysis Center (SIDC), Royal Observatory of Belgium (ROB).

Yearly medians of the solar-wind parameters and the yearly SSN together with the solar cycle number are shown in the upper part of Fig. 3. The reason for correlating the SSN to the

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.sidc.be/silso/>




**Fig. 3.** Solar-wind parameter yearly frequencies (gray shading) with yearly medians (lines) derived from OMNI data and the yearly SSN from the SILSO World Data Center (1963–2016) with solar cycle number (top). Their correlation coefficients with the yearly SSN are calculated for time lags back to −15 years (bottom).

solar-wind median values is because the position of a lognormal function is defined by its median. The data are averaged to yearly values to avoid seasonal effects during the Earth's orbit around the Sun caused by its variations in solar latitude and distance. The solar-wind velocity, density, and temperature depend on the state of the solar cycle (Schwenn 1983). For instance the fast solar wind occurs at times when polar coronal holes extend to lower latitudes, a typical feature of the declining phase of the solar cycle as pointed out by Bothmer & Daglis (2007, p. 75, Fig. 3.52). Therefore the solar-wind velocity, density, and temperature maxima exhibit time lags relative to the SSN maxima.

The correlation coefficients of the solar wind parameters with the yearly SSN shown in the bottom part of Fig. 3 are calculated for time lags back to −15 years to cover a time span longer than a solar cycle. As expected, the amplitudes of the variations in the correlations of all parameters decline with increasing time lag and show a period of about 11 years. The highest correlation coefficient of 0.728 to the SSN is found for the magnetic field strength; it has no time lag. This finding is anticipated because the SSN is found to be directly proportional to the evolution of the photospheric magnetic flux (Smith & Balogh 2003). Velocity and temperature show time lags of 3 years with peak correlation coefficients of 0.453 and 0.540. The density with a correlation coefficient of 0.468 has a time lag of 6 years, which is in agreement with the density anticorrelation to the SSN reported by Bougeret et al. (1984).

Next we create solar-activity-dependent analytical representations of the solar wind frequency distributions. This is achieved



**Fig. 5.** Solar-wind parameter medians with respect to the lagged SSN. The yearly data medians (+) with their weighted linear fit (solid lines) are obtained from OMNI data. The error bars denote the SSN standard deviation and the relative weight from the yearly data coverage. The SSN-dependent median (dashed lines) is derived from the lognormal model fit. For the velocity the median is derived from the SSN-weighting (9) of the slow and fast model parts (dotted lines), whose magnitudes are SSN independent.

by shifting the median positions of the lognormal distributions as a linear function of the SSN. To enable these shifts, we add a linear SSN dependency to the median,

$$x_{\text{med}}(ssn) = a_{\text{med}} \cdot ssn + b_{\text{med}}, \quad (7)$$

using a factor to the SSN  $a_{\text{med}}$  with a baseline  $b_{\text{med}}$ . We relate the mean with a scaling factor to the median to transfer its SSN dependency:

$$x_{\text{avg}}(ssn) = (1 + a_{\text{avg}}) \cdot x_{\text{med}}(ssn). \quad (8)$$

These relations, substituted into the lognormal function (4), lead to a new SSN-dependent function  $W'(x, ssn)$ . This function is then fitted to the yearly data, using the yearly SSN as input parameter. The SSN is offset with the individual time lags determined before for each parameter, to benefit from the higher correlation. The values of the three resulting fit coefficients ( $a_{\text{med}}$ ,  $b_{\text{med}}$  and  $a_{\text{avg}}$ ) are presented in Table 2.

Naturally, the fit models match with the general data trends, as can be seen from Fig. 4, though single year variations are not replicated by the model (e.g., the high velocity and temperature values in 1974, 1994, and 2003). The comparison of this model with the yearly data median values with respect to the lagged SSN shows that the medians obtained from the modeling have a similar slope, as shown in Fig. 5.


Again, the solar-wind velocity needs a special treatment because of the application of the double lognormal distribution (5). Since it is well known that slow and fast solar-wind stream occurrence rates follow the solar cycle, we keep the two velocity components' positions SSN-independent ( $x_{\text{med}} = b_{\text{med}}$ ) and vary instead their balance with the SSN:

$$c(ssn) = c_a \cdot ssn + c_b. \quad (9)$$

The fit result (see Table 2) yields a model in which three years after solar cycle minimum (SSN of zero) the contribution of slow

**Table 2.** Resulting fit coefficients from the OMNI data, based on the linear SSN dependencies (7) and (8). For the velocity the fit parameters from the double lognormal fit (5) and their balancing function (9) are given. The numbers in parentheses are the errors on the corresponding last digits of the quoted value. They are calculated from the estimated standard deviations of the fit parameters. The listed SSN time lags are used for the fits.

| Parameter                              | Median                      |                           | Mean<br>Scaling factor $a_{\text{avg}}$ | Balance   |  | SSN lag<br>[years] |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|--------------------|
|  | SSN factor $a_{\text{med}}$ | Baseline $b_{\text{med}}$ |   | SSN factor $c_a$  | Baseline $c_b$                           |                    |
| Magnetic field [nT]                    | $1.309(19) \times 10^{-2}$  | 4.285(17)                 | $8.786(78) \times 10^{-2}$              | —   | —  | 0                  |
| Density [ $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ]           | $3.81(25) \times 10^{-3}$   | 4.495(26)                 | $3.050(27) \times 10^{-1}$              | —   | —  | 6                  |
| Temperature [ $10^4 \text{ K}$ ]       | $1.974(26) \times 10^{-2}$  | 5.729(19)                 | $6.541(28) \times 10^{-1}$              | —   | —  | 3                  |
| Velocity<br>$[10^2 \text{ km s}^{-1}]$ | $W'_1$<br>$W'_2$            | —<br>—                    | 3.633(12)<br>4.831(81)                  | $1.008(37) \times 10^{-2}$<br>$2.31(20) \times 10^{-2}$ | $-1.799(95) \times 10^{-3}$<br>0.638(32) | 3                  |



**Fig. 4.** Solar wind parameter yearly data frequencies and lognormal fit models, both with their median values (white lines) over the OMNI time period 1963–2016. The corresponding yearly SSN and the shifted SSN for the models are indicated by gray and black lines. The velocity median is derived from the SSN-weighted constant lognormal parts (dotted lines).


solar wind to the overall solar wind distribution reaches a maximum value (about 64 %) and decreases with increasing SSN as shown in Fig. 6.

To investigate the amount of slow and fast wind contributions depending on solar activity, we apply the commonly used constant velocity threshold of  $v_{\text{th}} = 400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (Schwenn 1990, p. 144). The linear fit to the yearly data ratio and the derived model ratio show a good agreement (see Fig. 6). The to-some-degree steeper balance parameter of the double fit function used in this model cannot be compared directly with specific velocity thresholds between slow and fast solar wind. However, it appears to be a more realistic approach than just taking a specific velocity threshold for the slow and fast wind, in agreement with the overlapping nature of the velocity flows reported by McGregor et al. (2011a).

#### 4. Solar distance dependency

In order to derive heliocentric distance relationships of the bulk solar wind distribution functions, we apply and fit power law dependencies to the Helios data. We then examine how the fits may be extrapolated towards the Sun and in particular in to the PSP orbit. We use the fitting methods of Sect. 2 for the distance-binned combined data from both Helios probes. Helios' highly elliptical orbits in the ecliptic covered a solar distance range of 0.31–0.98 au in case of Helios 1 and 0.29–0.98 au in case of Helios 2. Launched during solar cycle minimum, the data of both probes cover the rise to the maximum of cycle 21, covering ~6.5 years at varying distances to the Sun.

We investigate hourly averages of the Helios data in the same way as with the OMNI data. The Helios 1 merged hourly data from the magnetometer and plasma instruments (Rosenbauer



**Fig. 6.** Ratio of slow to fast solar wind for a SSN lagged by 3 years. The yearly ratios (+) and their weighted linear fit (solid line) are obtained from OMNI data with a threshold velocity of  $v_{\text{th}} = 400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . The error bars denote the SSN standard deviation and the relative weight from the yearly data coverage. The model's balance parameter (9) and derived ratio (same threshold) are plotted as dashed and dotted lines.

et al. 1977) include  $\sim 12.5$  orbits for the time range 10 December 1974 to 14 June 1981, and those for Helios 2 include  $\sim 8$  orbits for the time span 1 January 1976 to 4 March 1980. The data are retrieved from the Coordinated Data Analysis Web (CDAWeb) interface at NASA's GSFC/SPDF<sup>5</sup>.

The Helios 1 magnetometer data coverage for this data set is about 43 % (i.e., 2.8 years), and that of Helios 2 amounts to 54 % (i.e., 2.3 years). The plasma data coverage is 76 % (i.e., 5.0 years) in case of Helios 1 and 92 % (i.e., 3.9 years) in case of Helios 2. Thus, using this data, we point out that its time coverage is unequally distributed over the solar cycle. Considering the data gap distributions, the amount of data during solar cycle minimum up to mid 1977, that is, the transition from minimum to maximum, covers about 68 % of this period whereas during maximum of cycle 21 data are available only 38 % of the time. This Helios data bias towards solar minimum is one reason why in this study the Helios solar wind data are not used to derive long-term frequency distributions and solar-cycle dependencies for the key solar wind parameters.

The radial dependencies of the key solar-wind parameters over the distance range 0.29–0.98 au measured by both Helios probes are plotted in Fig. 7, together with their median and mean values for different solar distances, calculated for the minimal distance resolution 0.01 au of the data set. Assuming a radial solar-wind outflow, it is expected that the distance dependence of the solar-wind parameters over the Helios data range 0.29–0.98 au can be described through power law scaling. Therefore we use the power law function,

$$x(r) = d \cdot r^e, \quad (10)$$

for the regression fit of the median and mean, with  $r$  being the solar distance in astronomical units,  $d$  the magnitude at 1 au and  $e$  the exponent. The fits are weighted through the different data counts per bin. The obtained coefficients for the median and mean power law fits ( $d_{\text{med}}$ ,  $e_{\text{med}}$ ,  $d_{\text{avg}}$  and  $e_{\text{avg}}$ ) are listed in Table 3 and their corresponding curves are shown in Fig. 7.

Our derived exponents agree with those found in existing studies from the Helios observations: Mariani et al. (1978) derived the exponents for the magnetic field strength separately for the fast and slow solar wind as  $B_{\text{fast}} \propto r^{-1.54}$  and  $B_{\text{slow}} \propto r^{-1.61}$ , ours is  $B_{\text{avg}} \propto r^{-1.55}$ . The velocity exponent  $v_{\text{avg}} \propto r^{0.049}$  matches with the values found by Schwenn (1983, 1990), who derived the distance dependencies for both Helios spacecraft separately

as  $v_{\text{H1}} \propto r^{0.083}$  and  $v_{\text{H2}} \propto r^{0.036}$ . The calculated density exponent  $n_{\text{avg}} \propto r^{-2.01}$  agrees well with the Helios plasma density model derived by Bougeret et al. (1984) yielding  $n \propto r^{-2.10}$ . The temperature exponent  $T_{\text{avg}} \propto r^{-0.79}$  is similar to those in the studies by Hellinger et al. (2011, 2013), who also derived the exponents separately for the fast and the slow solar wind:  $T_{\text{fast}} \propto r^{-0.74}$  and  $T_{\text{slow}} \propto r^{-0.58}$ .

The mean and median velocity fit exponents acquired from the Helios data are very similar, which indicates that they can be kept identical so that the basic shape of the frequency distribution does not change with distance. Conversely, the mean and median fits for the magnetic field strength cross each other at 0.339 au (see Table 3) and the mean becomes slightly lower than the median at smaller distances. Thus, below that distance the frequency distribution can no longer be well described by a lognormal function, because the mean of a lognormal function has to be larger than its median (as pointed out in Sect. 2), that is, the location of the crossing indicates that the parameter's distribution is no longer of a lognormal shape thereafter. The fits for the proton temperature show a similar behavior, having an extrapolated intersection at 0.082 au. Therefore the extrapolation of the magnetic field and temperature distribution frequencies to the PSP orbit by applying lognormal functions is limited. The crossing points limit the regions where the distribution's shapes can still be considered lognormal.


In order to still fit and extrapolate lognormal functions with the data, we assume that the shapes can be considered lognormal at all distances. For the frequency distribution fit function to be discussed in the following paragraph, we reduce the fit exponents  $e_{\text{med}}$  and  $e_{\text{avg}}$  to only one. We note that this simplification leads to slightly larger modeling errors, especially in case of the magnetic field strength.

Next we retrieve the frequency distributions of the four solar wind parameters in solar distance bins of 0.01 au, choosing the same resolution as for the OMNI data analyzed in Sect. 2 – the distributions and their median values are plotted in Fig. 8. For simplification, as mentioned before, we treat the exponents of the median and mean fit functions as being identical, using one fit parameter for both. Implementing the power law distance dependency (10) into the lognormal function (4), we get the fit parameters  $d'_{\text{med}}$ ,  $d'_{\text{avg}}$  and the common exponent  $e'$ . Again, we use the double lognormal function (5) for the velocity distribution fit – resulting in  $W''_v(x, r)$ . The additional fit parameters are the balancing parameter  $c'$  and for the second lognormal part  $d'_{\text{med},2}$  and  $d'_{\text{avg},2}$ . The resulting fit coefficients for the four solar wind parameters are presented in Table 4.

The velocity balancing parameter  $c' = 0.557$  is in good agreement with the results for the SSN dependency (9), because with a mean SSN of 59 during the Helios time period,  $c(59) = 0.53$ , as can be seen from Fig. 6.

The power law lognormal models and the power law double lognormal model for the velocity, which result from the fitting, are plotted in Fig. 8 together with their median values. The model's magnetic field strength is broader around values of 40 nT at the lower distance boundary than the data's frequency distribution implies. This behavior is expected because of the applied distance-independent shape approximation. The velocity and temperature models' upper values generally show a higher abundance than the actual data; see also zoom boxes in Figs. 1 and 2. The high-velocity tail that increases with distance arises from using the same exponent for both slow and fast components. This effect is not seen in the data; more specifically, not

<sup>5</sup> <http://spdf.gsfc.nasa.gov/>



**Fig. 7.** Helios hourly data plots of the four solar wind parameters over solar distance. The mean and median per 0.01 au data bin and their fit curves are plotted as well. The Helios data has a native distance resolution of 0.01 au, thus, to make the distribution visible in these plots, we added a random distance value of up to  $\pm 0.005$  au. The high velocity data points above  $800 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (circled red) are identified as CME events (e.g., Sheeley et al. 1985; Bothmer & Schwenn 1996, 1998).


**Table 3.** Fit coefficients for the median and mean solar distance dependencies (10) of the four solar wind parameters derived from the combined Helios 1 and 2 data. The numbers in parentheses are the errors on the corresponding last digits of the quoted value. They are calculated from the estimated standard deviations of the fit parameters. The crossing distances indicate where the median and mean fits intersect each other. The yearly variation is the weighted standard deviation derived from the yearly fit exponents seen in Fig. 9.

| Parameter                             | Median           |                  | Mean             |                  | Crossing distance<br>[au] | Yearly variation<br>$\Delta e$ |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                                       | $d_{\text{med}}$ | $e_{\text{med}}$ | $d_{\text{avg}}$ | $e_{\text{avg}}$ |                           |                                |
| Magnetic field [nT]                   | 5.377(92)        | -1.655(17)       | 6.05(10)         | -1.546(18)       | 0.339(11)                 | 0.11                           |
| Velocity [ $10^2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ] | 4.107(28)        | 0.058(13)        | 4.356(24)        | 0.049(10)        | $0.7(83) \times 10^3$     | 0.012                          |
| Density [ $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ]          | 5.61(27)         | -2.093(46)       | 7.57(30)         | -2.010(38)       | 0.027(73)                 | 0.072                          |
| Temperature [ $10^4 \text{ K}$ ]      | 7.14(23)         | -0.913(39)       | 9.67(21)         | -0.792(28)       | 0.082(85)                 | 0.050                          |

**Table 4.** Fit coefficients for the distance-dependent single lognormal function, based on Equation (4) combined with (10) from the combined Helios data. Regarding the velocity, the double lognormal function (5) is used instead. The numbers in parentheses are the errors on the corresponding last digits of the quoted value. They are calculated from the estimated standard deviations of the fit parameters. The seasonal variations are calculated from Earth's orbital solar distance variation and the derived exponents.

| Parameter                                | Median<br>$d'_{\text{med}}$                    | Mean<br>$d'_{\text{avg}}$ | Exponent<br>$e'$ | Balance<br>$c'$ | Seasonal variation<br>$\Delta d$ [%] |
|--|--|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Magnetic field [nT]                      | 5.358(25)                                      | 5.705(28)                 | -1.662(11)       | -               | 2.8                                  |
| Density [ $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ]             | 5.424(33)                                      | 6.845(47)                 | -2.114(20)       | -               | 3.6                                  |
| Temperature [ $10^4 \text{ K}$ ]         | 6.357(64)                                      | 10.72(14)                 | -1.100(20)       | -               | 1.9                                  |
| Velocity<br>[ $10^2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ] | $W''_1$<br>5.26(13)                            | 3.748(16)                 | 0.0990(51)       | 0.557(45)       | 0.17                                 |
|  | $W''_2$<br>$W''_{II}$<br>4.13(13) <sup>a</sup> | 5.42(11)                  | -                | -               | -                                    |
|  |  | 4.47(11) <sup>a</sup>     |                  |                 |                                      |

**Notes.** <sup>(a)</sup> Velocity median and mean 1 au values for the resulting function. Error estimates derived from the individual fit part errors.



**Fig. 8.** Frequency distributions of the four solar wind parameters with respect to solar distance. Plotted are the binned Helios data and the power law lognormal fit models with their median values (white lines). The double lognormal model is used for the velocity, its slow and fast parts are indicated by dotted lines.


only the slowest wind but also the fastest wind is expected to converge to more average speeds (Sanchez-Diaz et al. 2016).

## 5. Empirical solar-wind model

In order to estimate the solar-wind environment for the PSP orbit, we combine the results from the solar-wind frequency distributions' solar-activity relationships and their distance dependencies derived from the OMNI and Helios data. The result is an empirical solar-wind model for the inner heliosphere which is then extrapolated to the PSP orbit in Sect. 6.

This solar-wind model for the radial distance dependence is representative for the time of the Helios observations around the rise of solar cycle 21. The variations of the yearly power law fit exponents from fitting the solar-distance dependency (10) are shown in Fig. 9 together with the yearly SSN for the time period 1974–1982. It can be seen that during the Helios time period there might be some systematic variation of the exponents with solar activity – at least for the velocity and temperature exponents. However, for simplicity we assume that the distance scaling laws can be treated as time independent and include the calculated exponents' yearly variations  $\Delta e$ , summarized in Table 3, as relative uncertainties.

Since we neglect possible variations of the distance scaling laws, we combine the frequency distribution's median solar activity dependency (7) derived for 1 au from the OMNI data with



**Fig. 9.** Helios yearly variation of the solar wind parameter power exponents for the dependence on radial distance together with the SIDC 13-month smoothed monthly SSN. The weighted standard deviations and average values for all years are indicated by the shaded areas. In this plot, the 21 days since Helios launch in the year 1974 are omitted because a distance range of merely 0.95–0.98 au was covered that year.

the power law exponents (10) derived from the Helios data:

$$x_{\text{med}}(ssn, r) = (a_{\text{med}} \cdot ssn + b_{\text{med}}) \cdot r^{e'}. \quad (11)$$

Thus, implementing the median and mean relations into the log-normal function (4), we obtain the combined model function  $W'''(x, ssn, r)$  and for the velocity  $W''_{II}(x, ssn, r)$  with the double lognormal function (5). The corresponding median and mean relations for each solar-wind parameter, based on the values resulting from our analyses, are listed below. Their numerical values are the fit parameters from Table 2 and the exponents from Table 4.

- The magnetic field strength relations, depending on solar activity and solar distance, are:

$$B_{\text{med}}(ssn, r) = (0.0131 \text{ nT} \cdot ssn + 4.29 \text{ nT}) \cdot r^{-1.66}, \quad (12)$$

$$B_{\text{avg}}(ssn, r) = 1.0879 \cdot B_{\text{med}}(ssn, r). \quad (13)$$

- The proton velocity relations for the slow and fast components, depending on solar distance, are:

$$v_{\text{med}}^{\text{slow}}(r) = 363 \text{ km s}^{-1} \cdot r^{0.099}, \quad v_{\text{med}}^{\text{fast}}(r) = 483 \text{ km s}^{-1} \cdot r^{0.099}, \quad (14)$$

$$v_{\text{avg}}^{\text{slow}}(r) = 1.0101 \cdot v_{\text{med}}^{\text{slow}}(r), \quad v_{\text{avg}}^{\text{fast}}(r) = 1.023 \cdot v_{\text{med}}^{\text{fast}}(r). \quad (15)$$

The share of both components balanced with solar activity is found to be:

$$c(ssn) = -0.00180 \cdot ssn + 0.64. \quad (16)$$

- The derived relations of the proton density are:

$$n_{\text{med}}(ssn, r) = (0.0038 \text{ cm}^{-3} \cdot ssn + 4.50 \text{ cm}^{-3}) \cdot r^{-2.11}, \quad (17)$$

$$n_{\text{avg}}(ssn, r) = 1.305 \cdot n_{\text{med}}(ssn, r). \quad (18)$$

- The derived proton temperature relations are:

$$T_{\text{med}}(ssn, r) = (197 \text{ K} \cdot ssn + 57\,300 \text{ K}) \cdot r^{-1.10}, \quad (19)$$


$$T_{\text{avg}}(ssn, r) = 1.654 \cdot T_{\text{med}}(ssn, r). \quad (20)$$

These relations average over seasonal variations because they are based on yearly data. The OMNI data are time-shifted to the nose of the Earth's bow shock; this leads to yearly solar distance variations of  $\pm 1.67\%$  as it orbits the Sun. The resulting maximal solar-wind parameter variation amplitudes over the year can thus be derived from the derived power law exponents. They are estimated to be smaller than 4 % as seen in Table 4. Bruno et al. (1986) and Balogh et al. (1999) have pointed out that the solar-wind parameters vary with latitudinal separation from the heliospheric current sheet. Its position in heliographic latitude is highly variable around the solar equator (Schwenn 1990) and, furthermore, the Earth's orbit varies over the course of the year by  $\pm 7.2^\circ$  in latitude. Since this latitudinal separation is highly variable and requires significant effort to calculate for an extended time series, we have ignored this aspect in this analysis.

## 6. Model extrapolation to PSP orbit

To estimate PSP's solar-wind environment during its mission time for its orbital positions, predictions of the SSN during the mission are incorporated into the empirical solar-wind model, derived in the previous Sections, and extrapolations down to the PSP perihelion region are performed.


Parker Solar Probe is planned to launch in mid 2018. With its first Venus flyby it will swing into Venus' orbital plane, reaching a first perihelion with a distance of 0.16 au just 93 days after



**Fig. 10.** PSP's solar distance during its mission time (top). Consecutive Venus flybys bring its perihelia nearer to the Sun. Actual and predicted SSN (bottom), that is, SIDC 13-month smoothed monthly actual SSN, SIDC Standard Curves Kalman filter prediction and SWPC prediction with their corresponding expected ranges (shaded areas). The SSN from previous cycle 24, shifted by 11 years, is plotted together with two alternative trends of half and twice its amplitude.

launch, in November 2018. Seven additional Venus flybys allow the perihelion distance to be reduced to a minimum of  $0.16 \text{ au}$ . This distance will be reached with the 22nd perihelion in December 2024 (Fox et al. 2015), as plotted in the top panel of Fig. 10.

We extrapolate the derived empirical solar-wind models to PSP's orbital distance range and compare the results with those from the existing models shown in Fig. 11. The model and its extrapolation are visualized for the SSN range between solar minimum and maximum ( $0 \leq ssn \leq 200$ ), indicated by the shaded regions in the Figure. The magnetic field strength is found to increase from median values of about 43 nT at 0.25 au to 715 nT at 0.046 au for a SSN of zero. Taking a SSN of 200 increases the values to 69 nT and 1152 nT. Our extrapolation results are slightly flatter than those derived from the analytical magnetic field model by Banaszkiewicz et al. (1998), who constructed an analytic dipole plus quadrupole plus current sheet (DQCS) model for solar minimum. We note that one cannot easily compare the absolute values of our study with the values obtained by Banaszkiewicz et al. (1998) because the DQCS model assumes solar wind originating from coronal holes at higher heliographic latitudes only, neglecting the slow solar-wind belt. We suggest that the difference in slope is due to the previously mentioned (Sect. 4) changing shape of the frequency distribution with heliocentric distance, which for smaller distances deviates more from the model's lognormal distribution. The average velocity is found to decrease from  $340 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  at 0.25 au to about  $290 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  at 0.046 au 3 years after a SSN of zero occurred, whereas using a SSN of 200 it decreases from  $390 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  to  $330 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . Comparing the results with the measurements by Sheeley et al. (1997) and Wang et al. (2000) shows an overestimation in our extrapolated slow solar-wind velocity values for distances below approximately  $20 \text{ R}_\odot$ . They used LASCO coronagraph observations to track moving coronal features (blobs) in the distance range  $2\text{--}30 \text{ R}_\odot$  to determine speed profiles and sources of the slow solar wind and they derived temperature and sonic point values for slow solar wind with the isothermal expansion model from Parker (1958). Therefore, it generally can be expected that



**Fig. 11.** Radial extrapolation of the solar-wind parameters to the PSP orbit region. The median values from the models, obtained from Helios and OMNI measurements, are extrapolated to the PSP region for SSN values between solar minimum and maximum, that is,  $0 \leq \text{ssn} \leq 200$ . The lower edges of the shaded areas correspond to solar minimum, the upper edges to solar maximum. Also plotted are the radial dependencies of the analytic DQCS magnetic field model for solar minimum from Banaszkiewicz et al. (1998), the slow wind velocity models from Sheeley et al. (1997) and Wang et al. (2000), the density model from Leblanc et al. (1998) and the range of temperature measurements from Billings (1959) and Liebenberg et al. (1975).

PSP will encounter a slower solar-wind environment close to the Sun than our model estimates. Thus PSP will measure solar-wind acceleration processes (McComas et al. 2008), maybe even still at  $30 R_{\odot}$  as the study by Sheeley et al. (1997) suggests. The proton density increases from about  $84 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  at 0.25 au to about  $3018 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  at 0.046 au 6 years after a SSN of zero occurred. Being almost independent of the SSN, the values for a SSN of 200 are only 17 % larger. The results are in good agreement with those of Leblanc et al. (1998), who derived an electron density model from type III radio burst observations. Their model shows that the density distance dependency scales with  $r^{-2}$  and steepens just below  $10 R_{\odot}$  with  $r^{-6}$ . We assumed a solar-wind helium abundance of 5 % to convert these electron densities to proton densities. The extrapolated proton temperature increases from about 260 000 K at 0.25 au to about 1 690 000 K at 0.046 au 3 years after a SSN of zero occurred and from 440 000 K to 2 860 000 K for a SSN of 200. Knowing that near-Sun coronal temperatures are in the range of 2–3 MK (Billings 1959; Liebenberg et al. 1975), the model overestimates the extrapolated temperatures at the PSP perihelion distance.


Aside from the solar distance, the derived solar-wind parameter models depend on the SSN. Short-term predictions of the SSN can be used for the solar-wind predictions of PSP's early perihelia and also for refining the solar-wind predictions during PSP's mission. Several sources are available for SSN

short-term predictions. The SIDC provides 12-month SSN forecasts<sup>6</sup> obtained from different methods (e.g., Kalman filter Standard Curve method). The SSN prediction of NOAA's Space Weather Prediction Center (SWPC) for the time period until the end of 2019 follows a consensus of the Solar Cycle 24 Prediction Panel<sup>7</sup>. The SSN for PSP's first perihelion will be small – certainly below 20 – whereas the SSN during the closest perihelia, which will commence at the end of 2024 at the likely maximum phase of cycle 25, cannot be predicted at this time. However, Hathaway & Upton (2016) found indications that the next solar cycle will be similar in size to the current cycle 24. Therefore we simply assume a pattern similar to the last cycle for the prediction of the next solar cycle and thus shift the last cycle by 11 years. Additionally, we consider as possible alternatives SSN patterns of half and twice its amplitude as shown in the bottom panel of Fig. 10.


Implementing the SSN predictions for the PSP mission time and the orbital trajectory data, we can infer which solar-wind parameter magnitudes can be expected. Figures 12 and 13 show the median values (7) of the considered different solar-wind parameters for 12-day periods, comprising the first perihelion in

<sup>6</sup> <http://sidc.be/silso/forecasts>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.swpc.noaa.gov/products/solar-cycle-progression>




**Fig. 12.** Estimated solar-wind parameter medians (black lines) and their error bands (gray) during 12 days in 2018 with PSP's first perihelion at about 0.16 au. For the velocity the combined median is calculated and also the SSN-independent slow and fast parts are plotted (dotted lines).



**Fig. 13.** Estimated solar-wind parameter medians (black lines) and their error bands (gray) during 12 days in December 2024 with PSP's 22nd (the first closest) perihelion at 0.0459 au. For the velocity the combined median is calculated and also the SSN-independent slow and fast parts are plotted (dotted lines).

November 2018 and the first closest perihelion in December 2024. In the beginning of the mission median values of about 87 nT, 340 km s<sup>-1</sup>, 214 cm<sup>-3</sup> and 503 000 K are estimated to be measured at 0.16 au, increasing to about 943 nT, 290 km s<sup>-1</sup>, 2951 cm<sup>-3</sup> and 1 930 000 K during the first closest approach at 0.046 au. Monthly SSNs – shifted by the time lags specific to the solar-wind parameters – are used in the calculation of the solar-wind predictions. These SSNs are either actual smoothed values from the SIDC with their reported standard deviations, short-term predictions from the SWPC with their expected ranges, or actual smoothed values from the SIDC shifted by 11 years with half/twice their values as uncertainties. The error bands given in both Figures, calculated from error propagation, include these SSN ranges and the derived fit parameter errors.

Finally the estimated solar-wind environment can be derived from the function  $W'''(x, ssn, r)$ . The estimated frequency distributions of the four solar-wind parameters at PSP's 1st and 22nd



**Fig. 14.** Frequency distributions of the four solar-wind parameters (same as in Figs. 1 and 2) and those estimated with the solar-wind model for PSP's 1st and 22nd (first closest) perihelion. In these Figures the frequencies of both extrapolated curves are scaled for visibility to the same height as the 1 au distribution.

(first closest) perihelion are plotted in Fig. 14. Again, we point out that the velocity and temperature distributions for the 22nd perihelion are only upper limits and the actual values to be encountered by PSP are expected to be smaller.

## 7. Discussion and summary

The scientific objective of this study, being part of the CGAUSS project – the German contribution to the WISPR instrument – is to model the solar-wind environment for the PSP mission to be launched mid 2018. For this purpose we started the development of the empirical solar-wind environment model for the near-ecliptic PSP orbit. We derived lognormal representations of the in situ near-Earth solar-wind data collected in the OMNI database, using the frequency distributions of the key solar-wind parameters, magnetic field strength, proton velocity, density, and temperature. Throughout the different analyses in our study, the velocity's frequency distribution is treated as a composition of a slow and a fast wind distribution. Each velocity part is fitted with a lognormal function, which allows for the overlap of both velocity ranges. The OMNI multi-spacecraft solar-wind data is intercalibrated and covers almost five solar cycles. It thus represents solar wind gathered at different phases of solar activity in the ecliptic plane. In the next step we investigated the yearly variation of the solar-wind distribution functions along with the SSN over 53 years and derived linear dependencies of the solar-wind parameters with the SSN. The radial dependencies of the solar-wind distribution functions were then analyzed, using Helios 1 and 2 data for the distance range 0.29–0.98 au in bins of 0.01 au, deriving power law fit functions that were used to scale the previously calculated SSN-dependent 1 au distribution fit functions to the PSP orbit, taking into account SSN predictions for the years 2018–2025, encompassing the prime mission up to the closest approach of 9.86 R<sub>⊕</sub>. The reason for performing the analysis this way is based on the fact that the OMNI solar-wind database is much larger than the Helios database.

For determining solar-activity- and solar-distance-dependent relations for the median and mean solar-wind values, we could have used the simpler approach of combining the radial depen-

dence of averaged Helios data with averaged 1 au OMNI data scaled with the SSN. It is expected that the results of a simpler analysis would have similar distance scaling results, as can be inferred from the exponents in Tables 3 and 4. However, in our study we are not only interested in averages but rather in bulk distributions, that is, the whole range of values that might occur. For the determination of the frequency distributions the use of the more complex fit model is important, because the distance between median and mean values determines the width of the lognormal distributions.

It is clear that the calculated distribution functions only represent first-order estimates of the real solar wind to be encountered by PSP. The solar-wind environment to be encountered will depend at times of PSP on the structure of the solar corona and underlying photospheric magnetic field and on the evolution and interaction of individual solar-wind streams and superimposed CMEs and shocks. However, the derived results are in good agreement with existing studies about near-Sun solar-wind magnetic field strengths and densities as shown in Sect. 6. The extrapolation results of the velocity and the temperature differ from the direct measurements seen in existing studies. This suggests that below about  $20 R_{\odot}$  PSP may dive into the region where the acceleration and heating of the solar wind is expected to occur (see Fig. 11). The near-Sun solar-wind velocity at PSP perihelion is also expected to be slower than our model estimates, because the solar wind is assumed to be accelerated up to the height of the Alfvénic critical surface, which is predicted to lie on average around  $17 R_{\odot}$  (e.g., Sittler & Guhathakurta 1999; Exarhos & Moussas 2000), scaling with solar activity within a range of between  $15 R_{\odot}$  at solar minimum and  $30 R_{\odot}$  at solar maximum (Katsikas et al. 2010; Goelzer et al. 2014).

We have not specifically investigated the occurrences of extreme solar-wind parameters caused by CMEs or enhanced values due to stream interaction or co-rotating interaction regions. The Helios solar-wind measurements plotted over radial distance in Fig. 7 show several extreme values far above the usual solar-wind velocities, which are associated with individual CMEs. The results by Sachdeva et al. (2017) indicate that due to solar-wind drag, the speeds of fast CMEs will commonly slow down substantially from early distances of a few solar radii. Therefore, it is expected that PSP will encounter CMEs with much higher speeds than those observed during the Helios mission. Also, the magnetic field, density and temperature values are expected to be much larger than in the average solar wind in individual fast-shock-associated CME events. PSP will thus also substantially improve our understanding of the near-Sun evolution of CMEs and their expansion with radial distance.

With the resulting CGAUSS empirical solar-wind model for PSP, the following main results for the bulk solar-wind parameters and estimations for their median values at PSP's first perihelion in 2018 at a solar distance of 0.16 au and at PSP's closest perihelia beginning in 2024 at 0.046 au ( $9.86 R_{\odot}$ ) are obtained:

- The dependency of the magnetic field strength on solar activity and radial distance appears to be valid above  $20 R_{\odot}$ , however near PSP's closest perihelia, the actual values might be found to be slightly higher.
- The estimated magnetic field strength median values obtained from relation (12) for PSP's 1st and 22nd perihelion are 87 nT and 943 nT.
- The radial dependencies of the proton velocity median values for slow and fast solar wind (14) appear to be valid above about  $20 R_{\odot}$  solar distance; below they overestimate the actual solar wind velocities obtained from remote measurements. The share of their frequency distributions to the

overall solar-wind velocity distribution (5) depends on solar activity with their balance relation (16). Thus, at solar minimum, with a SSN of around zero, the slow-wind component contributes about 64 % and drops to 28 % during solar maximum conditions with a SSN around 200.

- The calculated median velocity values for PSP's 1st and 22nd perihelion are  $340 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and  $290 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ .
- The proton density relation appears to be valid throughout the full PSP orbital distance range, even down to about  $8 R_{\odot}$ .
- The estimated density median values obtained from relation (17) for PSP's 1st and 22nd perihelion are  $214 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  and  $2951 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ .
- The derived correlation function for the proton temperature appears to provide overly high temperature values around PSP's closest perihelion in comparison to coronal measurements.
- The estimated temperature median values obtained from relation (19) for PSP's 1st and 22nd perihelion are 503 000 K and 1 930 000 K.

The results of the modeled solar-wind environment will be useful to help optimize the WISPR and in situ instrument science plannings and PSP mission operations. This also applies for the Heliospheric Imager (SoloHI) (Howard et al. 2013) and the in situ instruments on board the Solar Orbiter spacecraft.

**Acknowledgements.** The authors acknowledge support of the Coronagraphic German and US SolarProbePlus Survey (CGAUSS) project for WISPR by the German Aerospace Center (DLR) under grant 50 OL 1601 as national contribution to the Parker Solar Probe mission. The authors thank the Helios and OMNI PIs/teams for creating and making available the solar wind in situ data. The Helios and the OMNI data are supplied by the NASA Space Science Data Coordinated Archive and the Space Physics Data Facility at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center. Additional thanks for maintaining and providing the international sunspot number series goes to the World Data Center – Sunspot Index and Long-term Solar Observations at the Solar Influences Data Analysis Center, Royal Observatory of Belgium. The PSP SPICE kernel was kindly provided by Angelos Vourlidas. The authors thank the referee for the careful review of this manuscript and helpful comments and suggestions.

## References

- Bale, S. D., Goetz, K., Harvey, P. R., et al. 2016, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 204, 49  
 Balogh, A., Bothmer, V., Crooker, N. U., et al. 1999, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 89, 141  
 Balazsakiewicz, M., Axford, W. I., & McKenzie, J. F. 1998, *A&A*, 337, 940  
 Belcher, J. W., Slavin, J. A., Armstrong, T. P., et al. 1991, *Mercury Orbiter: Report of the Science Working Team* (Washington, United States)  
 Biermann, L. 1951, *ZAp*, 29, 274  
 Billings, D. E. 1959, *ApJ*, 130, 961  
 Bothmer, V. & Daglis, I. A. 2007, *Space Weather – Physics and Effects* (Praxis Publishing)  
 Bothmer, V. & Schwenn, R. 1996, *Advances in Space Research*, 17  
 Bothmer, V. & Schwenn, R. 1998, *Annales Geophysicae*, 16, 1  
 Bougeret, J.-L., King, J. H., & Schwenn, R. 1984, *Sol. Phys.*, 90, 401  
 Bruno, R., Villante, U., Bavassano, B., Schwenn, R., & Mariani, F. 1986, *Sol. Phys.*, 104, 431  
 Burt, J. & Smith, B. 2012, in 2012 IEEE Aerospace Conference, 1–13  
 Colin, L. 1980, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 85, 7575  
 Domingo, V., Fleck, B., & Poland, A. I. 1995, *Sol. Phys.*, 162, 1  
 Exarhos, G. & Moussas, X. 2000, *A&A*, 356, 315  
 Feldman, W. C., Asbridge, J. R., Bame, S. J., & Gosling, J. T. 1978, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 83, 2177  
 Forsyth, R. J., Bothmer, V., Cid, C., et al. 2006, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 123, 383  
 Fox, N. J., Velli, M. C., Bale, S. D., et al. 2015, *Space Sci. Rev.*  
 Goelzer, M. L., Schwadron, N. A., & Smith, C. W. 2014, *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 119, 115  
 Gosling, J. T., Hildner, E., MacQueen, R. M., et al. 1974, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 79, 4581  
 Gringauz, K. I., Bezrukikh, V. V., Ozerov, V. D., & Rybchinskii, R. E. 1960, *Soviet Physics Doklady*, 5, 361  
 Gurnett, D. A., Kurth, W. S., Burlaga, L. F., & Ness, N. F. 2013, *Science*, 341, 1489

- Hathaway, D. H. & Upton, L. A. 2016, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 121, 10
- Hellinger, P., Matteini, L., Štverák, Š., Trávníček, P. M., & Marsch, E. 2011, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 116, A09105
- Hellinger, P., Trávníček, P. M., Štverák, Š., Matteini, L., & Velli, M. 2013, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 118, 1351
- Howard, R. A., Vourlidas, A., Korendyke, C. M., et al. 2013, in Proc. SPIE, Vol. 8862, Solar Physics and Space Weather Instrumentation V, 88620H
- Kasper, J. C., Abiad, R., Austin, G., et al. 2016, Space Sci. Rev., 204, 131
- Kasper, J. C., Stevens, M. L., Korreck, K. E., et al. 2012, ApJ, 745, 162
- Katsikas, V., Exarhos, G., & Moussas, X. 2010, Advances in Space Research, 46, 382
- Kilpua, E. K. J., Madjarska, M. S., Karna, N., et al. 2016, Sol. Phys., 291, 2441
- King, J. H. & Papitashvili, N. E. 2005, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 110, A02104
- Lazarus, A. J. 2000, Science, 287, 2172
- Leblanc, Y., Dulk, G. A., & Bougeret, J.-L. 1998, Sol. Phys., 183, 165
- Lepping, R. P., Acúña, M. H., Burlaga, L. F., et al. 1995, Space Sci. Rev., 71, 207
- Liebenberg, D. H., Bessey, R. J., & Watson, B. 1975, Sol. Phys., 44, 345
- Mariani, F., Ness, N. F., Burlaga, L. F., Bavassano, B., & Villante, U. 1978, J. Geophys. Res., 83, 5161
- McComas, D. J., Acton, L. W., Balat-Pichelin, M., et al. 2008, Solar Probe Plus: Report of the Science and Technology Definition Team, Tech. Rep. NASA/TM-2008-214161, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD
- McComas, D. J., Alexander, N., Angold, N., et al. 2016, Space Sci. Rev., 204, 187
- McComas, D. J., Bame, S. J., Barraclough, B. L., et al. 1998, Geophys. Res. Lett., 25, 1
- McGregor, S. L., Hughes, W. J., Arge, C. N., Odstrcil, D., & Schwadron, N. A. 2011a, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 116, A03106
- McGregor, S. L., Hughes, W. J., Arge, C. N., Owens, M. J., & Odstrcil, D. 2011b, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 116, A03101
- Müller, D., Marsden, R. G., St. Cyr, O. C., & Gilbert, H. R. 2013, Sol. Phys., 285, 25
- Neugebauer, M. & Snyder, C. W. 1966, J. Geophys. Res., 71, 4469
- Ogilvie, K. W., Chornay, D. J., Fritzenreiter, R. J., et al. 1995, Space Sci. Rev., 71, 55
- Parker, E. N. 1958, ApJ, 128, 664
- Richardson, I. G. & Cane, H. V. 2012, Journal of Space Weather and Space Climate, 2, A2
- Rosenbauer, H., Schwenn, R., Marsch, E., et al. 1977, Journal of Geophysics Zeitschrift Geophysik, 42, 561
- Russell, C. T., Mewaldt, R. A., Luhmann, J. G., et al. 2013, ApJ, 770, 38
- Sachdeva, N., Subramanian, P., Vourlidas, A., & Bothmer, V. 2017, Sol. Phys., 292, 118
- Sanchez-Diaz, E., Rouillard, A. P., Lavraud, B., et al. 2016, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 121, 2830
- Schwenn, R. 1983, in NASA Conference Publication, Vol. 228, NASA Conference Publication
- Schwenn, R. 1990, Large-Scale Structure of the Interplanetary Medium (Springer Berlin Heidelberg), 99–181
- Sheeley, N. R., Wang, Y.-M., Hawley, S. H., et al. 1997, ApJ, 484, 472
- Sheeley, Jr., N. R., Howard, R. A., Michels, D. J., et al. 1985, J. Geophys. Res., 90, 163
- SILSO World Data Center. 1963–2016, International Sunspot Number Monthly Bulletin and online catalogue
- Sittler, Jr., E. C. & Guhathakurta, M. 1999, ApJ, 523, 812
- Smith, E. J. & Balogh, A. 2003, in American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 679, Solar Wind Ten, ed. M. Velli, R. Bruno, F. Malara, & B. Bucci, 67–70
- Stone, E. C., Frandsen, A. M., Mewaldt, R. A., et al. 1998, Space Sci. Rev., 86, 1
- Veselovsky, I. S., Dmitriev, A. V., & Suvorova, A. V. 2010, Cosmic Research, 48, 113
- Vourlidas, A., Howard, R. A., Plunkett, S. P., et al. 2016, Space Sci. Rev., 204, 83
- Wang, Y.-M., Sheeley, N. R., Socker, D. G., Howard, R. A., & Rich, N. B. 2000, J. Geophys. Res., 105, 25133

## 8 Helios radial line-up passings

have a look into Schwenn1984...

To derive the radial dependence of the solar wind parameters directly, we look at the passings when both Helios spacecraft were radially lined up. In these cases they flew through the same solar wind at different solar distances.

(This eliminates the bias of averaging over slow and fast wind streams, like the described model does.)  
see also [Schwenn \(1990\)](#) p. 156 + p. 122...

we compare these independently derived radial fit functions to those obtained from the averaging over all solar wind types...

There were eight passings when both Helios spacecraft were radially lined-up (see [Figure 8.1](#)). These points in time, when both probes had no separation in heliographic longitude, are derived from Helios 1 and Helios 2 daily trajectory data (for the data source see Section XX). The data is linear interpolated to get an hourly resolution. The resulting points in time together with solar distances are listed in [Table 8.1](#).

The last two passings were merely one week apart and the Helios probes flew almost without radial separation because Helios 2 overtook Helios 1 during its perihelion. As we want to analyze the same solar wind at different solar distances, we exclude the passings 7 and 8 from further analyses.

The passing longitude is not the same as the longitude where the solar wind is detected by both spacecraft consecutively. A passing occurs shortly before the points in time when both spacecraft observe the same solar wind. For the outer probe this point in time is shifted by the solar wind's travel time. The travel time depends on the solar wind's velocity and its distance traveled.

Based on the obtained spacecraft line-up time  $t_0$  one can calculate the offset times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  when the inner and outer spacecraft pass by the same solar wind (see [Figure 8.2](#)). At the solar wind line-up longitude the condition

$$t_2 = t_1 + t_{sw} \quad (8.1)$$

holds. As the offset times depend on the solar wind travel time between the probes, we need knowledge of the solar wind velocity  $v$  for their calculation:  $t_{sw} = dr/v$ , with the mean radial separation distance  $dr$  between the probes.

For the calculation of  $t_1$  we recall the third Kepler law


$$\frac{T_1^2}{T_2^2} = \frac{a_1^3}{a_2^3} \quad (8.2)$$

with the orbital periods  $T_1, T_2$  and the semi-major axes  $a_1, a_2$ . The assumption of circular orbits (why? what error size?) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{t_1^2}{(t_1 + t_{sw})^2} &= \frac{r_1^3}{r_2^3} \\ \Leftrightarrow \quad t_1 &= t_{sw} \left( \left( \frac{r_1}{r_2} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} - 1 \right)^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

and finally the offset time  $t_1$  only depends on the variable solar wind travel time  $t_{sw}$ .

Due to uncertainties in the travel time  $t_{sw}$  (the solar wind speed  $v$  is obviously not a constant) the exact calculation of  $t_1$  is imprecise. To get a reliable result we perform two iterations calculating the offset time from the average velocity  $\bar{v}$  of the surrounding 2-day period. We use the velocity  $\bar{v}_0$  around  $t_0$  to calculate the offset time  $t'_1$  as a first estimate. As the velocity  $\bar{v}'_1$  at  $t'_1$  is certainly different, we use this velocity to refine the value and obtain  $t_1$ . Hence deriving the velocity  $\bar{v}_1$  enables us to calculate the solar wind travel time  $t_{sw}$ .



**Figure 8.1** Schema of the eight spacecraft line-up positions of both Helios probes on their respective orbits. make B&W... combine with fig 5.15? calibrate text size

**Table 8.1** Times when both Helios probes had no separation in heliographic longitude. Their solar distances (inner spacecraft  $r_1$ , outer spacecraft  $r_2$ ) were in the range 0.291–0.731 au and the maximal inter-probe radial distance  $dr$  was 0.229 au. errors in au...

| Passing | Date       | Time  | Inner s/c | $r_1$<br>[au] | $r_2$<br>[au] | $dr$<br>[au] |
|---------|------------|-------|-----------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1       | 1976-03-09 | 00:00 | Helios 1  | 0.513         | 0.731         | 0.219        |
| 2       | 1976-05-02 | 14:00 | Helios 2  | 0.442         | 0.671         | 0.229        |
| 3       | 1976-09-19 | 10:00 | Helios 1  | 0.457         | 0.637         | 0.180        |
| 4       | 1976-10-31 | 11:00 | Helios 2  | 0.390         | 0.576         | 0.186        |
| 5       | 1977-04-02 | 12:00 | Helios 1  | 0.394         | 0.519         | 0.125        |
| 6       | 1977-04-30 | 23:00 | Helios 2  | 0.337         | 0.465         | 0.128        |
| 7       | 1977-10-18 | 06:00 | Helios 1  | 0.316         | 0.345         | 0.029        |
| 8       | 1977-10-25 | 19:00 | Helios 2  | 0.291         | 0.327         | 0.035        |

The average velocities are obtained from the hourly merged (mag?) and (plasma?) Helios data set (see Section XX). The resulting offset times and velocities of both iterations together with the travel times are listed in [Table 8.2](#).


For the solar wind line-up longitude condition (8.1) holds. For all other positions the solar wind measured by the inner spacecraft will not arrive the outer orbit position at the same time as the outer spacecraft does (see [Figure 8.3](#)).

Either the spacecraft (negative lag time) or the solar wind (positive lag time) already have passed this position:

$$t_2 = t_1 + t_{sw} + t_{lag}. \quad (8.4)$$

This lag time  $t_{lag}$  is the time difference at which the solar wind is probed by both spacecraft. At the spacecraft line-up longitude ( $t_1 = t_2 = 0$ ) the lag time equals the solar wind travel time and at the solar wind line-up longitude the lag time is zero.

We choose to look at time periods (instead of points in time) around the offset times to derive average solar wind parameters. This helps reducing the influence of solar wind fluctuations.



**Figure 8.2** Illustration of the solar wind line-up longitude situation with the spacecraft line-up time  $t_0$ , the offset times  $t_1$ ,  $t_2$  (at which the spacecraft measure the same solar wind) and the solar wind travel time  $t_{sw}$ . combine with fig 5.14?

**Table 8.2** The two iterations of the derived offset times and average velocities. The resulting solar wind travel times have durations of 11–28 hours. errors...

| Passing | Inner s/c | $v_0$<br>[km/s] | $t'_1$<br>[h] | $v'_1$<br>[km/s] | $t_1$<br>[h] | $v_1$<br>[km/s] | $t_{sw}$<br>[h] |
|---------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1       | Helios 1  | 659.3           | 19.6          | 656.9            | 19.7         | 656.9           | 13.9            |
| 2       | Helios 2  | 436.4           | 25.1          | 370.9            | 29.5         | 356.7           | 26.7            |
| 3       | Helios 1  | 482.6           | 24.0          | 444.0            | 26.1         | 413.8           | 18.1            |
| 4       | Helios 2  | 302.3           | 32.2          | 279.9            | 34.8         | 278.3           | 27.8            |
| 5       | Helios 1  | 507.3           | 20.0          | 474.8            | 21.4         | 473.5           | 11.0            |
| 6       | Helios 2  | 321.2           | 26.6          | 392.6            | 21.7         | 367.8           | 14.5            |

We define the period duration boundaries as when the lag time  $t_{lag}$  is in the range  $\pm 24$  h. For the outer spacecraft these periods are almost twice as long as for the inner spacecraft. The calculated period start and end hours (relative to  $t_0$ ) for both spacecraft are listed in [Table 8.3](#) together with the data coverage of these periods.

**Table 8.3** Derived period start and end hours for both spacecraft in relation to the longitude line-up time  $t_0$ . The corresponding combined data coverage within that period of the magnetic field, velocity, density and temperature is listed as well. instead duration! errors...


| Period | Inner spacecraft |              |            |                 | Outer spacecraft |            |                 |
|--------|------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
|        | s/c              | Start<br>[h] | End<br>[h] | Coverage<br>[%] | Start<br>[h]     | End<br>[h] | Coverage<br>[%] |
| 1      | Helios 1         | -14.4        | 53.8       | 73              | -24.6            | 91.6       | 99              |
| 2      | Helios 2         | 3.1          | 58.3       | 89              | 5.8              | 109.0      | 88              |
| 3      | Helios 1         | -9.2         | 65.1       | 16              | -15.1            | 107.2      | 10              |
| 4      | Helios 2         | 4.8          | 65.2       | 59              | 8.5              | 117.0      | 87              |
| 5      | Helios 1         | -25.5        | 68.3       | 89              | -38.5            | 103.3      | 88              |
| 6      | Helios 2         | -15.3        | 61.7       | 93              | -24.8            | 100.1      | 92              |

For period 3 the combined data coverage of the four solar wind parameters is only 16 % (Helios 1) and 10 % (Helios 2) respectively. We consider this as insufficient for the continuing analysis and therefore also omit period 3.

The five remaining periods are marked in [Figure 8.4](#).

The average values of the four parameters magnetic field  $B$ , velocity  $v$ , density  $n$  and temperature  $T$  are listed in [Table 8.4](#).

If we compare both, the inner solar wind sections together with their outer counterparts, they indeed appear to have a similar shape apart from the time shift (see [Figure 8.5](#)) (name definite features...). This confirms that



**Figure 8.3** Illustration like Figure 8.2 but for arbitrary longitude situations a lag time  $t_{\text{lag}}$  comes into play. merge with fig 5.14?

**Table 8.4** Average values of the four solar wind parameters magnetic field, velocity, density and temperature for the individual periods and spacecraft. errors...

| Period | Inner spacecraft |           |             |                    | Outer spacecraft |           |             |                    |          |
|--------|------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------------|----------|
|        | s/c              | B<br>[nT] | v<br>[km/s] | n<br>[cm $^{-3}$ ] | T<br>[K]         | B<br>[nT] | v<br>[km/s] | n<br>[cm $^{-3}$ ] | T<br>[K] |
| 1      | Helios 1         | 17.04     | 646.4       | 12.0               | 367 300          | 8.93      | 602.8       | 6.7                | 244 000  |
| 2      | Helios 2         | 15.77     | 356.4       | 38.8               | 122 400          | 12.05     | 390.2       | 17.7               | 117 200  |
| 4      | Helios 2         | 15.18     | 281.3       | 108.0              | 46 000           | 10.64     | 298.6       | 46.1               | 30 400   |
| 5      | Helios 1         | 28.80     | 521.3       | 45.9               | 337 800          | 18.73     | 530.3       | 24.4               | 282 000  |
| 6      | Helios 2         | 29.57     | 402.4       | 82.5               | 271 900          | 14.71     | 432.6       | 35.7               | 199 100  |

they indeed are parts of the same solar wind structures.  
maybe figures of all into Appendix?...

the comparison to the sw model's mean value at the individual distances lets us classify the solar wind types...

**Period 1** HSS

**Period 2** medium–LSS

**Period 4** LSS

**Period 5** medium–HSS

**Period 6** LSS–HSS

We obtained the mean parameter values for the inner and outer solar wind sections. As with the overall radial dependency before, these two points are fitted to the exponential regression fit function  $X(r) = X_0 r^{cx}$  (see Section XX. The resulting fit coefficients for each period are listed in Table 8.5.  
why is it better to fit the period's mean values than the whole period?...  
we fit the periods' mean value rather than the whole periods, because...


The fit curves show noticeable deviations from the model's mean fit (see Figure 8.6). maybe 4-panel figure?; maybe figures of all into Appendix?

The observed deviations are as expected from these types of solar wind. ...are they? analyze each in detail... argue from sw type; slow, medium and fast type; check their position relative to the mean curve...

results:

features of calculated line-up periods match.


their derived fit functions scatter within (acceptable?) margin around model's radial mean, backing its applicability.



**Figure 8.4** Scheme of the line-up periods of both Helios spacecraft on their respective orbits. The corresponding orbit sections which we consider in our analysis are marked in color. These sections span the positions where both spacecraft observed the same solar wind with a maximal lag time of  $\pm 24$  hours. bw figure?? dotted lines?

**Table 8.5** Radial fit functions  $B(r)$ ,  $v(r)$ ,  $n(r)$  and  $T(r)$  for each period. or only the variables into table? error sizes...


| Period                              | $B(r) = B_0 r^{c_B}$<br>[nT] | $v(r) = v_0 r^{c_v}$<br>[km/s] | $n(r) = n_0 r^{c_n}$<br>[cm $^{-3}$ ] | $T(r) = T_0 r^{c_T}$<br>[K] |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1                                   | $4.88 r^{-1.815}$            | $564.7 r^{-0.196}$             | $3.9 r^{-1.647}$                      | $166\,500 r^{-1.148}$       |
| 2                                   | $9.50 r^{-0.654}$            | $442.6 r^{0.220}$              | $8.9 r^{-1.902}$                      | $112\,800 r^{-0.106}$       |
| 4                                   | $6.79 r^{-0.900}$            | $322.0 r^{0.151}$              | $15.7 r^{-2.155}$                     | $18\,000 r^{-1.047}$        |
| 5                                   | $5.99 r^{-1.649}$            | $554.8 r^{0.065}$              | $4.6 r^{-2.423}$                      | $174\,700 r^{-0.692}$       |
| 6                                   | $3.22 r^{-2.108}$            | $506.5 r^{0.219}$              | $5.7 r^{-2.533}$                      | $101\,000 r^{-0.941}$       |
| Weighted by duration mean functions |                              |                                |                                       |                             |
| mean of sw model (update)           | $6.078 r^{-1.563}$           | $435.5 r^{0.04955}$            | $7.613 r^{-2.032}$                    | $97\,050 r^{-0.8002}$       |



**Figure 8.5** Measured solar wind parameters  $B$ ,  $v$ ,  $n$ , and  $T$  of both spacecraft in the period 1. Also plotted is the spacecraft's separation in heliographic longitude. offset time, time shift; expected value from the radial sw model... remove data... remove solar distance... adjust text size...

## 8. Helios radial line-up passings

---



**Figure 8.6** Fit curves of the radial magnetic field. The fits are based on the mean values (meanr,meanB; black points) of the line-up periods. build pdf figure... remove date... adjust text size... 4-figure?

## 9 Results, discussion and conclusions

already in chapters:

results

discussion

conclusions

end matter:

summary

outlook

Prediction:

Long-term solar wind parameter predictions from SSN

Link from near-Sun solar wind measurements to K<sub>p</sub> impact

Link from near-Sun structure (CMEs, CIRs) measurements to K<sub>p</sub> impact



## 10 Summary and outlook

Outlook

DSCOVR data (advantages over ACE? gain?)  
anticipated Solar Probe Plus data (near-Sun data)

other possible space weather missions: sub-L1 (earlier in situ CME magnitude warning) and L5 (early CME velocity and arrival warning)

I built an empirical solar wind model for the ecliptical inner heliosphere which accounts for variations in time (season and solar cycle) and space (solar distance).

Using the SSN prediction the model allows the forecast and extrapolation of the solar wind, which will occur during the SPP mission's first near-Sun perihelion in mid-2018.



# A Physics

## A.1 Electromagnetism

Electromagnetism is one of the four fundamental forces at the common level of energy. In all situations examined in this thesis (sw plasma, magnetosphere) it is by far the strongest force and the others can be neglected.

The Lorentz force:  $\mathbf{F} = q(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B})$

The Maxwell equations in differential notation:

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{B} = 0 \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{D} = \rho \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{j} + \dot{\mathbf{D}} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\operatorname{rot} \mathbf{E} = -\dot{\mathbf{B}} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

With the magnetic flux density  $\mathbf{B}$  (aka magnetic field), the electric displacement field  $\mathbf{D}$ , the charge density  $\rho$ , the magnetic field  $\mathbf{H}$ , the electric field  $\mathbf{E}$  and the current density  $\mathbf{j}$ .

## A.2 Solar wind pressures

The magnetic energy density  $w_{\text{mag}}$  is also the magnetic pressure  $p_{\text{mag}}$

$$w_{\text{mag}} = p_{\text{mag}} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$= \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

dynamic pressure  $p_{\text{dyn}} = \rho v^2$   
 thermal pressure  $p_{\text{therm}} = nk_B T$   
 magnetic pressure  $p_{\text{mag}} = B^2/(2\mu_0)$  (see above...)  
 ram pressure??

## A.3 Plasma beta

In MHD the magnetic energy density behaves like an additional pressure that adds to the gas pressure of a plasma (Wikipedia; find alternative source...).

The ratio of the thermal pressure  $p = nk_B T$  to the magnetic pressure  $p_{\text{mag}} = \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0}$  is called plasma beta

$$\beta = \frac{p}{p_{\text{mag}}} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$= \frac{2\mu_0 nk_B T}{B^2} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

with the number density  $n$ .

$\beta \ll 1$ : “cold” plasma; magnetic field contains plasma (magnetic clouds)

$\beta \geq 1$ : “warm” plasma; plasma keeps magnetic field

plasma beta see ([Kivelson & Russell 1995](#), p. 50)

typical *beta*-values for solar wind are in the range X–Y.

## A.4 Alfvén waves

named after Hannes Alfvén...

There exists an incompressible wave mode which is a result of bending magnetic field lines called shear Alfvén wave.

In an ideal incompressible MHD plasma (viscosity  $\mu = 0$  and electrical conductivity  $\sigma = \infty$ ) the kinetic and magnetic energy density are of equal value:

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\text{kin}} &= w_{\text{mag}} \\ \frac{\rho v^2}{2} &= \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} \end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

with the permeability constant

$$\mu_0 = 4\pi \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ N A}^{-2}$$

and the total mass density  $\rho$  of the charged plasma particles.

So waves propagate with the so-called Alfvén velocity

$$v_A = \frac{|B|}{\sqrt{\mu_0 \rho}}. \tag{A.10}$$

Their phase velocity is

$$v_{\text{ph}} = v_A \cos(\theta) \tag{A.11}$$

with  $\theta$  the angle between wave propagation direction ( $k$ ) and magnetic field line ( $B$ ). => Alfvén waves travel along magnetic field lines. Alfvén waves are characterized by periodic disturbances in the magnetic field perpendicular to its direction, in the electric field, in the plasma velocity and in the current density. They do not affect the plasma density, plasma pressure and magnetic field magnitude.

Additionally, there exist two types of compressional waves within MHD plasmas, the fast-mode wave and the slow-mode wave. The phase speeds of the three MHD waves meet  $v_{\text{fast}} \geq v_A \geq v_{\text{slow}}$ .

Alfvén waves are dominant in regions that are open to the heliosphere.

Alfvén waves see (Kivelson & Russell 1995, pp. 51ff.)

Within average solar wind at 1 au their typical frequency is 1–4 per hour (cite?) ( $v_A = 53 \text{ km/s}$  for  $B = 5.6 \text{ nT}$  and  $\rho = 5.3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ).

critical surfaces, solar wind acceleration...

## A.5 Solar surface differential rotation

the solar rotation was first discovered from sunspots in 18XX?

Bartels (1934) set the synodic solar rotation period to 27 days for the definition of his solar rotation number. The Bartels' Rotation Number counts the solar rotations starting with 8 February 1832.

Carrington solar rotation period of 27.2753 days (Where Carrington Rotation Number is based upon, starting with November 9, 1853; Wikipedia...)

Solar surface rotation period at 16° latitude:

sidereal: 25.38 d (of 609.12 h Sun Fact Sheet...), synodic: 27.2753 d (derived)

rotation axis tilt (see next section)

The Sun's inner thermal convective circulation results in a differential rotation caused by transport of angular momentum away from the rotation axis.

The Sun's sidereal differential angular velocity best-fitting function with values as stated in (Sun Fact Sheet...)<sup>1</sup> is


$$\omega_{\odot} = A + B \sin^2(b) + C \sin^4(b) \tag{A.12}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>NASA's Sun Fact Sheet (<http://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/planetary/factsheet/sunfact.html>, accessed 2016-08-19).

with the latitude  $b$ , the equatorial angular velocity  $A = 14.37^\circ/\text{d}$ , the coefficients  $B = -2.33^\circ/\text{d}$  and  $C = -1.56^\circ/\text{d}$  (see Figure A.1).

see Figure A.1



**Figure A.1** Diagram of the sidereal solar surface differential rotation. It shows the angular velocity for different latitudes. remove sides...

Thus, the solar equatorial rotation period (sidereal) is

$$T_{\odot}^{\text{eq}} = 360^\circ/A \\ = 25.05 \text{ d} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

and the synodic period is

$$T_{\odot}^{\text{eq,syn}} = 1/(1/T_{\odot}^{\text{eq}} - 1/T_{\text{Earth}}) \\ = 26.90 \text{ d} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

with the Earth's orbital rotation period  $T_{\text{Earth}} = 365.25 \text{ d}$  (1/100 Julian century).

Solar surface rotation period at equator  
sidereal: 25.05 d (Sun Fact Sheet...), synodic: 26.90 d (derived)  
Solar surface rotation period at poles:  
sidereal: 34.35 d (diff. rot. formula), synodic: 37.92 d (derived)  
are listed in Table A.1.

**Table A.1** Solar surface rotation periods for equator,  $\pm 16^\circ$  latitude and poles (sidereal and synodic).

|          | Equator<br>[d] | $\pm 16^\circ$ latitude<br>[d] | Poles<br>[d] |
|----------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|
| Sidereal | 25.05          | 25.38                          | 34.35        |
| Synodic  | 26.90          | 27.2753 <sup>a</sup>           | 37.92        |

<sup>a</sup>Carrington solar rotation period

The meridional circulation is the proposed equatorial updrift and polar downdraft - a result of Reynolds stress and convective transport (cite?).

## A.6 Earth orbit geometry

orbit defines ecliptic

Earth orbit parameters (cite?):  
semimajor axis:  $a = 1.000001018 \text{ au}$   
eccentricity:  $e = 0.0167086 \text{ au}$   
distance at perihelion: (formula cite?, accuracy?)

$$\begin{aligned} r_p &= a(1 - e) \\ &= 0.98329 \text{ au} \end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

distance at aphelion:

$$\begin{aligned} r_p &= a(1 + e) \\ &= 1.0167 \text{ au} \end{aligned} \tag{A.16}$$

for calculation of heliospheric distance see HORIZONS Web-Interface at <http://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/horizons.cgi>

perihelion/aphelion times...

### A.6.1 Solar distance

Sun-Earth distance over the course of the year.

In the year 2017 Earth's perihelion was on 5 January with a distance of  $-1.67\%$  from 1 au (Horizons On-Line Ephemeris System<sup>2</sup>, Solar System Dynamics Group, Jet Propulsion Laboratory).

The cosine approximation

$$r_E(t) = 1 - 0.0167 \cdot \cos\left(2\pi\left(t - 2017 - \frac{5}{365}\right)\right), \tag{A.17}$$

with  $t$  in years, suffices for our accuracy requirements.

seasonal variation function:

$$X_{\text{avg}}(t) = a r_E(t)^b$$

### A.6.2 Solar rotation axis tilt

The inclination of the solar equator to the ecliptic (tilt/obliquity) is  $i_\odot = 7.25^\circ$  (U.S. Nautical Almanac Office 2015).

Viewed from Earth the projected solar rotation axis tilt angle varies as the Earth is moving on its orbit.

At the time XX the angle is zero.

The projected tilt angle to Earth over the year is

Hapgood (1992):

$$\omega = 73.67 + 0.013\,958 * (\text{today} - 1850.0) \tag{A.18}$$

solar tilt over the year, see Figure A.2

### A.6.3 Earth tilt

## A.7 Coordinate systems

Coordinate systems used in this thesis:

GSE - Geocentric Solar Ecliptic

GSM - Geocentric Solar Magnetospheric


HGI - Heliographic Inertial

refer to Hapgood (1992) for GSE and GSM

figures for GSE and GSM

---

<sup>2</sup><http://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/horizons.cgi>



**Figure A.2** Projected solar tilt angle over the year as viewed from Earth. remove sides...

### A.7.1 Geocentric Solar Ecliptic

The Geocentric Solar Ecliptic (GSE) coordinates are  
 GSE - Geocentric Solar Ecliptic  
 X = Earth-Sun Line  
 Z = Ecliptic North Pole  
 GSE coordinates are used in ACE solar wind data, etc.

### A.7.2 Geocentric Solar Magnetospheric

GSM - Geocentric Solar Magnetospheric  
 X = Earth-Sun Line  
 Z = Projection of dipole axis on GSE YZ plane

GSM is defined with a time dependent dipole axis.  
 the dipole axis orientation changes over time; at 1995 the northern pole was at  $l = 288.59^\circ$  and  $b = 79.30^\circ$ ; more recent year (2015)?... cite?

### A.7.3 Heliographic Inertial

Heliographic Inertial (HGI) coordinates  
 HGI coordinates are Sun-centered with the z-axis directed along the solar rotation axis and directed northward of the solar equator. The solar equator plane is inclined  $7.25^\circ$  from the ecliptic.

HGI coordinates; latitude range  $-7.25^\circ$  to  $-7.25^\circ$   
 latitude variation (see Schwenn1990, p. 127)



## B Math

### B.1 Correlations

auto correlation

cross correlation


Pearson linear correlation

Spearman rank correlation

Correlation in Linear Regression: <http://www.stat.yale.edu/Courses/1997-98/101/correl.htm>

### B.2 Lognormal distribution

This is a small summary about the lognormal probability distribution (Bronstein et al. 2000, p. 780). The lognormal distribution is the distribution of a random variable  $X$  if the logarithm of  $X$  conforms to a normal distribution. Its shape is highly asymmetric, however in a semi-log plot the Gaussian bell curve is recognizable (see the second panel of Figure B.1). Its probability density function is



**Figure B.1** The lognormal probability density function ( $\sigma = 1, \mu = 0$ ) plotted in a linear, semi-log and log-log way. remove borders...

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}x} e^{-\frac{(\ln x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (\text{B.1})$$


with the location ( $\mu$ ) and the shape parameter ( $\sigma$ ). Changes in  $\mu$  affect both the horizontal and vertical scaling of the function, whereas  $\sigma$  has an influence on its shape (see Figure B.2).

Because it is a probability distribution, its area is normalized

$$\int_0^\infty f(x)dx = 1. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For a lognormally distributed random variable the geometric moments mean, standard deviation and variance are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_g &= e^\mu, \\ \sigma_g &= e^\sigma, \\ var_g &= e^{\sigma^2} (!). \end{aligned}$$



**Figure B.2** Five lognormal distributions plotted with fixed  $\sigma$  (top) and fixed  $\mu$  (bottom). remove borders...

Its arithmetic moments are:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_a &= e^{\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}, \\ \sigma_a &= e^{\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}} (e^{\sigma^2} - 1), \\ var_a &= \sigma_a^2.\end{aligned}$$

Other useful characteristics are the median and the mode

$$\begin{aligned}x_{\text{median}} &= e^\mu, \\ x_{\text{mode}} &= e^{\mu - \sigma^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that for the lognormal distribution its median is equal to its geometric mean.

Applications of lognormal distributions...

Most natural quantities which can only be positive are lognormally distributed. e.g. animal body sizes?, animal life expectancies, financial stock prices...; income distributions.

### B.3 Goodness of fit

$SSR$  – sum of squared residuals

$$SSR = \sum_i (y_i - f_i)^2 \tag{B.3}$$

data values  $y_i$ , fit function values  $f_i$

$SSR_{\text{red}}$  – reduced SSR, divided by number of degrees of freedom  $v$

$$SSR_{\text{red}} = \frac{SSR}{v} \tag{B.4}$$

$TSS$  – total sum of squares (in relation to the data mean)

$$TSS = \sum_i (y_i - \bar{y})^2 \tag{B.5}$$

with data mean  $\bar{y}$

$\chi^2$  – chi-square

$\chi^2_{\text{red}}$  – reduced chi-square, divided by number of degrees of freedom  $\nu$

$R^2$  – coefficient of determination

$0 \leq R^2 \leq 1$ , “values can be less than zero”!. if  $R^2 = 1 \rightarrow$  ideal fit; if  $R^2 = 0 \rightarrow$  bad fit

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{SSR}{TSS} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

“In case of a single regressor, fitted by least squares,  $R^2$  is the square of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient relating the regressor and the response variable.” cite from wikipedia

Kolmogorov-Smirnov K-S-Test

## B.4 other

minimum variance analysis (MVA)

determining magnetic cloud configuration (Bothmer & Schwenn 1998)

hodogramm?

least-squares fit approximates mean linear regression

robust statistics

Non-parametric inferential statistical methods are mathematical procedures for statistical hypothesis testing which make no assumptions about the probability distributions of the variables being assessed. The most frequently used tests include - median - percentiles (quartiles) - Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient

histogram

generalized mean [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generalized\\_mean](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generalized_mean)

normal distribution



## C Glossary

### C.1 Astronomical constants

Astronomical unit: 1 au = 149 597 870 700 m ([U.S. Nautical Almanac Office 2015](#))  
Solar mass:  $M_{\odot} = 1.9884(2) \times 10^{30}$  kg ([U.S. Nautical Almanac Office 2015](#))  
Nominal solar radius (photosphere):  $R_{\odot} = 695\,700$  km ([Mamajek et al. 2015](#))  
Sun escape velocity:  $v_{\text{esc}} = 617.6$  km/s (Sun Fact Sheet...)  
Solar rotation axis tilt:  $i_{\odot} = 7.25^\circ$  ([U.S. Nautical Almanac Office 2015](#))  
Solar surface rotation period at equator, sidereal: 25.05 d (Sun Fact Sheet...)  
Nominal solar effective temperature (photosphere):  $T_{\text{eff}\odot} = 5772$  K ([Mamajek et al. 2015](#))

### C.2 Symbols

s/c - spacecraft  
 $B$  - magnetic field strength  
 $n$  - number density  
...

### C.3 Abbreviations

Projects:

**AFFECTS** Advanced Forecast For Ensuring Communications Through Space  
**HELCATS** Heliographic Cataloging, Analysis and Techniques Service  
**FP7** Framework Programme 7  
**CGAUSS** Coronagraphic German And US SolarProbePlus Survey  
**OPTIMAP** OPerational Tool for Ionospheric Mapping And Prediction

Spacecraft:  
SPP – Solar Probe Plus  
WISPR – Wide-field Imager for Solar Probe  
ACE – Advanced Composition Explorer  
MAG – Magnetometer  
SWEPAM – Solar Wind Electron Proton Alpha Monitor  
RTSW – Real Time Solar Wind  
SDO – Solar Dynamics Observatory  
SOHO – Solar and Heliospheric Observatory  
STEREO – Solar TErrestrial RElations Observatory

Organizations:  
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
SPDF – Space Physics Data Facility  
NOAA – National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
SWPC – Space Weather Prediction Center  
UGOE – University of Göttingen  
IAG – Institute for Astrophysics Göttingen  
GFZ – GeoForschungsZentrum  
WDC-SILSO – World Data Center-Sunspot Index and Long-term Solar Observations

## C. Glossary

---

Sun:

DB – disparition brusques (disappearing filaments?; quiescent filaments?)  
SSN – sunspot number

Solar wind:

IMF – interplanetary magnetic field  
CME – coronal mass ejection  
ICME – interplanetary coronal mass ejection  
MC – magnetic cloud  
HSS – high speed stream  
CIR – corotating interaction region  
SIR – stream interaction region  
SB – sector boundary  
BDE – bidirectional electrons  
HCS – heliospheric current sheet  
HPS – heliospheric plasma sheet

Earth:

Kp – planetare Kennziffer  
Dst – Disturbance storm time

Coordinate systems:

GSE – geocentric solar ecliptic  
GSM – geocentric solar magnetospheric

Theories and techniques:

MVA – minimum variance analysis  
MHD – magnetohydrodynamic  
GCS – Graduated Cylindrical Shell  
CAT – CME Analysis Tool

## References

- Bahcall, J. N., Pinsonneault, M. H. & Wasserburg, G. J. 1995, *Solar models with helium and heavy-element diffusion*, Reviews of Modern Physics, 67, 781, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1995RvMP...67..781B>.
- Balogh, A. & Jokipii, J. R. 2009, *The Heliospheric Magnetic Field and Its Extension to the Inner Heliosheath*, Space Sci. Rev., 143, 85, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2009SSRv..143...85B>.
- Banaszkiewicz, M., Axford, W. I. & McKenzie, J. F. 1998, *An analytic solar magnetic field model*, Astron. Astrophys., 337, 940, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1998A&26A...337..940B>.
- Bartels, J. 1934, *Twenty-seven day recurrences in terrestrial-magnetic and solar activity, 1923-1933*, Terrestrial Magnetism and Atmospheric Electricity (Journal of Geophysical Research), 39, 201, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1934TeMAE..39..201B>.
- . 1962, *Zur Vorgeschichte der Weltraumforschung*, Naturwissenschaften, 49, 313, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1962NW.....49..313B>.
- Bartels, J., Heck, N. H. & Johnston, H. F. 1939, *The three-hour-range index measuring geomagnetic activity*, Terrestrial Magnetism and Atmospheric Electricity (Journal of Geophysical Research), 44, 411, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1939TeMAE..44..411B>.
- Bartels, J. & Veldkamp, J. 1949, *International Data on Magnetic Disturbances, First Quarter, 1949*, J. Geophys. Res., 54, 295, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1949JGR....54..295B>.
- Belcher, J. W., Lazarus, A. J., McNutt, Jr., R. L. & Gordon, Jr., G. S. 1993, *Large-scale density structures in the outer heliosphere*, Advances in Space Research, 13, 41, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1993AdSpR..13...41B>.
- Billings, D. E. 1959, *Distribution of Matter with Temperature in the Emission Corona.*, Astrophys. J., 130, 961, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1959ApJ...130..961B>.
- Bothmer, V. 1993, *Die Struktur magnetischer Wolken im Sonnenwind: Zusammenhang mit eruptiven Protuberanzen und Einfluß auf die Magnetosphäre der Erde*, PhD thesis, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, <http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-001M-0000-0014-F2C4-2>.
- Bothmer, V. & Daglis, I. A. 2007, *Space Weather – Physics and Effects* (Praxis Publishing), <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2007swpe.book.....B>, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-34578-7.
- Bothmer, V. & Schwenn, R. 1998, *The structure and origin of magnetic clouds in the solar wind*, Annales Geophysicae, 16, 1, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1998AnGeo..16....1B>.
- Bronstein, I. N., Semendjajew, K. A., Musiol, G. & Mühlig, H. 2000, *Taschenbuch der Mathematik* (Verlag Harri Deutsch), <https://books.google.de/books?id=zCKyuQAACAAJ>.
- Cane, H. V. & Richardson, I. G. 2003, *Interplanetary coronal mass ejections in the near-Earth solar wind during 1996-2002*, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 108, 1156, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2003JGRA..108.1156C>.
- Carrington, R. C. 1859, *Description of a Singular Appearance seen in the Sun on September 1, 1859*, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., 20, 13, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1859MNRAS..20...13C>.
- Christensen-Dalsgaard, J., Gough, D. O. & Thompson, M. J. 1991, *The depth of the solar convection zone*, Astrophys. J., 378, 413, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1991ApJ...378..413C>.
- Christensen-Dalsgaard, J., Dappen, W., Ajukov, S. V. et al. 1996, *The Current State of Solar Modeling*, Science, 272, 1286, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1996Sci...272.1286C>.
- Clark, D. H. & Stephenson, F. R. 1978, *An Interpretation of the Pre-Telescopic Sunspot Records from the Orient*, Quart. J. R. Astron. Soc., 19, 387, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1978QJRAS..19..387C>.

## References

---

- Cranmer, S. R. & van Ballegooijen, A. A. 2005, *On the Generation, Propagation, and Reflection of Alfvén Waves from the Solar Photosphere to the Distant Heliosphere*, *Astrophys. J., Suppl. Ser.*, 156, 265, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2005ApJS..156..265C>.
- Danziger, I. J. 1970, *The Cosmic Abundance of Helium*, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 8, 161, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1970ARA&D...8..161D>.
- Elliott, H. A., Jahn, J.-M. & McComas, D. J. 2013, *The K<sub>p</sub> index and solar wind speed relationship: Insights for improving space weather forecasts*, *Space Weather*, 11, 339, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2013SpWea..11..339E>.
- Gurnett, D. A., Kurth, W. S., Burlaga, L. F. & Ness, N. F. 2013, *In Situ Observations of Interstellar Plasma with Voyager 1*, *Science*, 341, 1489, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2013Sci...341.1489G>.
- Hapgood, M. A. 1992, *Space physics coordinate transformations - A user guide*, *Planet. Space Sci.*, 40, 711, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1992P&SS...40..711H>.
- Hathaway, D. H. 2015, *The Solar Cycle*, *Living Reviews in Solar Physics*, 12, 4, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2015LRSP...12....4H>.
- Hathaway, D. H. & Upton, L. A. 2016, *Predicting the amplitude and hemispheric asymmetry of solar cycle 25 with surface flux transport*, *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 121, 10, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2016JGRA..12110744H>.
- Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology. 2008, *JCGM 100: Evaluation of Measurement Data - Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement*, Tech. rep., JCGM, <https://www.bipm.org/en/publications/guides/gum.html>.
- King, J. H. & Papitashvili, N. E. 2005, *Solar wind spatial scales in and comparisons of hourly Wind and ACE plasma and magnetic field data*, *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 110, 2104, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2005JGRA..110.2104K>.
- Kivelson, M. G. & Russell, C. T. 1995, *Introduction to Space Physics* (Cambridge University Press), <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1995isp..book.....K>.
- Leitner, M., Farrugia, C. J., Möstl, C. et al. 2007, *Consequences of the force-free model of magnetic clouds for their heliospheric evolution*, *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 112, 6113, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2007JGRA..112.6113L>.
- Lem, S. & Kandel, M. 1984, *His Master's Voice* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt), <http://books.google.de/books?id=nzgLf4zKph0C>.
- Liebenberg, D. H., Bessey, R. J. & Watson, B. 1975, *Coronal emission line profile observations at total solar eclipses. II - 30 May 1965 results, deconvolution and interpretation*, *Solar Phys.*, 44, 345, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1975SoPh...44..345L>.
- Machol, J. L., Reinard, A. A., Viereck, R. A. & Biesecker, D. A. 2013, *Identification and replacement of proton-contaminated real-time ACE solar wind measurements*, *Space Weather*, 11, 434, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2013SpWea..11..434M>.
- Mamajek, E. E., Prsa, A., Torres, G. et al. 2015, *IAU 2015 Resolution B3 on Recommended Nominal Conversion Constants for Selected Solar and Planetary Properties*, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1510.07674, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2015arXiv151007674M>.
- Maunder, E. W. 1890, *Prof. Spoerer's researches on Sun-spots*, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 50, 251, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1890MNRAS..50..251S>.
- . 1904, *Note on the distribution of sun-spots in heliographic latitude, 1874-1902*, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 64, 747, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1904MNRAS..64..747M>.
- McComas, D. J., Ebert, R. W., Elliott, H. A. et al. 2008, *Weaker solar wind from the polar coronal holes and the whole Sun*, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, L18103, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2008GeoRL..3518103M>.

- Miesch, M. S. 2005, *Large-Scale Dynamics of the Convection Zone and Tachocline*, Living Reviews in Solar Physics, 2, 1, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2005LRSP....2....1M>.
- Newell, P. T., Sotirelis, T., Liou, K., Meng, C.-I. & Rich, F. J. 2007, *A nearly universal solar wind-magnetosphere coupling function inferred from 10 magnetospheric state variables*, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 112, A01206, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2007JGRA..112.1206N>.
- Newell, P. T., Sotirelis, T., Liou, K. & Rich, F. J. 2008, *Pairs of solar wind-magnetosphere coupling functions: Combining a merging term with a viscous term works best*, Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 113, A04218, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2008JGRA..113.4218N>.
- Opher, M., Drake, J. F., Swisdak, M. et al. 2011, *Is the Magnetic Field in the Heliosheath Laminar or a Turbulent Sea of Bubbles?*, *Astrophys. J.*, 734, 71, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2011ApJ...734..71O>.
- Ossendrijver, M. 2003, *The solar dynamo*, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.*, 11, 287, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2003A&26ARv..11..287O>.
- Owens, M. J. & Forsyth, R. J. 2013, *The Heliospheric Magnetic Field*, Living Reviews in Solar Physics, 10, 5, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2013LRSP...10....5O>.
- Parker, E. N. 1958, *Dynamics of the Interplanetary Gas and Magnetic Fields.*, *Astrophys. J.*, 128, 664, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1958ApJ...128..664P>.
- Pizzo, V. J. 1991, *The evolution of corotating stream fronts near the ecliptic plane in the inner solar system. II - Three-dimensional tilted-dipole fronts*, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 96, 5405, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1991JGR....96.5405P>.
- Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N. et al. 2016, *Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 594, A13, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2016A&26A...594A..13P>.
- Richardson, I. G. & Cane, H. V. 2010, *Near-Earth Interplanetary Coronal Mass Ejections During Solar Cycle 23 (1996 - 2009): Catalog and Summary of Properties*, *Solar Phys.*, 264, 189, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2010SoPh..264..189R>.
- . 2012, *Near-earth solar wind flows and related geomagnetic activity during more than four solar cycles (1963-2011)*, *Journal of Space Weather and Space Climate*, 2, A2, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2012JSWSC...2A..02R>.
- Richardson, I. G., Cliver, E. W. & Cane, H. V. 2000, *Sources of geomagnetic activity over the solar cycle: Relative importance of coronal mass ejections, high-speed streams, and slow solar wind*, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105, 18203, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2000JGR...10518203R>.
- Richardson, J. D., Paularena, K. I., Lazarus, A. J. & Belcher, J. W. 1995, *Radial evolution of the solar wind from IMP 8 to Voyager 2*, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 22, 325, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1995GeoRL..22..325R>.
- Richardson, J. D. & Smith, C. W. 2003, *The radial temperature profile of the solar wind*, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, 1206, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2003GeoRL..30.1206R>.
- Rotter, T., Veronig, A. M., Temmer, M. & Vršnak, B. 2012, *Relation Between Coronal Hole Areas on the Sun and the Solar Wind Parameters at 1 AU*, *Solar Phys.*, 281, 793, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2012SoPh..281..793R>.
- Russell, C. T. 2007, *The coupling of the solar wind to the Earth's magnetosphere*, ed. V. Bothmer & I. A. Daglis, *Space Weather- Physics and Effects*, 103, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2007swpe.book..103R>.
- Russell, C. T., Mewaldt, R. A., Luhmann, J. G. et al. 2013, *The Very Unusual Interplanetary Coronal Mass Ejection of 2012 July 23: A Blast Wave Mediated by Solar Energetic Particles*, *Astrophys. J.*, 770, 38, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2013ApJ...770...38R>.
- Schatten, K. H. & Sofia, S. 1987, *Forecast of an exceptionally large even-numbered solar cycle*, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 14, 632, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1987GeoRL..14..632S>.

## References

---

- Schatten, K. H., Wilcox, J. M. & Ness, N. F. 1969, *A model of interplanetary and coronal magnetic fields*, Solar Phys., 6, 442, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1969SoPh....6..442S>.
- Schröder, W., ed. 2004, Some aspects of the earlier history of solar-terrestrial physics: Zur Entstehung der solar-terrestrischen Physik.
- Schwenn, R. 1983, *The average solar wind in the inner heliosphere: Structures and slow variations*, in NASA Conference Publication, Vol. 228, NASA Conference Publication, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1983NASCP.2280.489S>.
- Schwenn, R. 1990, *Large-Scale Structure of the Interplanetary Medium*, ed. R. Schwenn & E. Marsch, Physics of the Inner Heliosphere I, 99, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1990pihl.book...99S>.
- Temmer, M. & Nitta, N. V. 2015, *Interplanetary Propagation Behavior of the Fast Coronal Mass Ejection on 23 July 2012*, Solar Phys., 290, 919, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2015SoPh..290..919T>.
- Thompson, M. J., Christensen-Dalsgaard, J., Miesch, M. S. & Toomre, J. 2003, *The Internal Rotation of the Sun*, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys., 41, 599, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2003ARA%26A..41..599T>.
- U.S. Nautical Almanac Office. 2015, *Astronomical Almanac for the Year 2016 and Its Companion, the Astronomical Almanac Online* (United States Department of Defense), [https://books.google.de/books?id=Mc\\_VuQN\\_gVsC](https://books.google.de/books?id=Mc_VuQN_gVsC).
- Vaquero, J. M. 2007, *Letter to the Editor: Sunspot observations by Theophrastus revisited*, Journal of the British Astronomical Association, 117, 346, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2007JBAA..117..346V>.
- Vršnak, B., Temmer, M. & Veronig, A. M. 2007, *Coronal Holes and Solar Wind High-Speed Streams: I. Forecasting the Solar Wind Parameters*, Solar Phys., 240, 315, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2007SoPh..240..315V>.
- Zhao, J., Bogart, R. S., Kosovichev, A. G., Duvall, Jr., T. L. & Hartlep, T. 2013, *Detection of Equatorward Meridional Flow and Evidence of Double-cell Meridional Circulation inside the Sun*, Astrophys. J., Lett., 774, L29, <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2013ApJ...774L..29Z>.

# Acknowledgments

I thank

my supervisor Volker Bothmer

the committee (Ansgar Reiners, second?)

the proofreaders

The author like to thank the proofreaders for very helpful comments and suggestions.

the 'Büro' for cozily accomodating me all the long hours

for creating and making scientific data available:

- SWS list (see Acknowledgements in Elliott2013; directly Ian Richardson)
- OMNI data (see paper)
- ACE data
- Helios data (see paper)
- K<sub>p</sub> data
- SSN data

I acknowledge the financial support from the projects

AFFECTS: Solar wind correlation with magnetosphere

CGAUSS: Solar wind model and extrapolation

HELCATS: Minimum variance analyses of magnetic clouds

OPTIMAP: Solar wind ACE time series

This work was done within the scope of the CGAUSS project, funded by the German Aerospace Center (grant number...).

The authors thank the Helios and OMNI teams for creating and making availabe the solar wind in situ data. The Helios and the OMNI data sets were supplied by the Space Physics Data Facility at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center.

We thank the 'referees' for /important comments and suggestions. /careful review of this paper.

facilities/persons which made available the Helios and OMNI data

"Ian Richardson and Hilary Cane for making their Interplanetary Coronal Mass Ejection list readily available"

"Joseph King and Natalia Papitashvili for creating the combined OMNI data set"

The OMNI data were downloaded from NASA's Space Physics Data Facility ...

"We thank the reviewers for the careful review of this paper"

The Authors extend their thanks to the referee for important comments and suggestions.

This work was supported by the DLR CGAUSS project

We would like to thank XX for reading drafts of this manuscript...

This work has been done in the frame of the CGAUSS project (url), funded by the DLR

We would like to thank the Helios team and NASA's SPDF for supplying the plasma and magnetic field data (url)

The results presented in this thesis rely on the *K<sub>p</sub>* index, calculated and made available by the German Research Centre for Geosciences in Potsdam from data collected at magnetic observatories. We thank the involved national institutes, the INTERMAGNET network and ISGI (isgi.unistra.fr).



## Curriculum vitae

Malte Venzmer, born 5 February 1984 in Bremerhaven, Lower Saxony, Germany, finished secondary school (Abitur) at the Gymnasium Ganderkesee in 2003. Subsequently he performed his civilian service working in a care home for disabled persons in Westerland, Sylt.

In 2004 he began to study physics at the University of Konstanz. During his studies, in summer 2008, he did an internship at the Ångström Laboratory, Uppsala University, Sweden, working in the field of materials physics. In 2010/2011 he wrote his diploma thesis in the *Radio- and X-ray astronomy* group of Dr. Jürgen Kerp at the Argelander-Institute for Astronomy, University of Bonn. There, following his diploma in physics, he continued working under a scholarship until end of 2011.

In 2012 he started as a PhD candidate in the *Solar, heliospheric and space weather research* group of Dr. Volker Bothmer at the Institute for Astrophysics, University of Göttingen. During his doctoral studies he worked as a research assistant for several national and international projects. Most of his main results are described in this very thesis.

## notes

Fragen:

- references vol # fett drucken?
- references journal kursiv drucken?
- maybe style references different. like in space science reviews?
- page # oben lassen?
- A5 format?

nice phrases:

...this leads to the question wh... . The answer to this question is developed in the course of the next section.

write basics without third persons view “we”

define if using astronomical symbols...

...and use style consistently

Letzte Änderungen:

Genehmigungen für die Abb. besorgen!!

check for topic sentences!

Am Anfang der Arbeit den folgenden logischen Aufbau der Kapitel erlaeutern.

Am Anfang jedes Kapitels den folgenden logischen Aufbau der Abschnitte erlaeutern.

Beides auf Aenderungen ueberpruefen.

print figures to check look of colors

adjust figure width to textwidth...

complete pdfinfo text...

Abkuerzungen CME, usw. konsequent nutzen und beim ersten Auftauchen ausschreiben.

englische Kommasetzung beachten!

schauen, ob Kommata oder Punkte durch Semikolon ersetzt werden koennen

Pruefen, ob Ueberschriften den Inhalt des Kapitels gut beschreiben/gut zum Kapitel passen.

check if AE spelling consistently, search and replace: analyse, etc.

check for thin spaces in numbers with 5 digits and more

Header und footer fuer notes, seitenzahl, Thema und Kapitel einfuegen

check gnuplot plot text sizes and finish figures

check for changed links and update access date

sinnlosen Satz irgendwo einfügen

76 %, ACME irgendwo einfügen (ACME is good...)

comic strip aus thesis extrahieren

put movie in header or footer

create hyperref version including bibtex links

adjust link colors and remove boxes... (hyperref package options)

remove google-books links!

maybe adjust References like in Hathaway2010

LaTeX commands:

block commenting: strg+d

strg+shift+d

$$N_{mean_0} = \text{æee e e e e e e} \quad (C.1)$$

$$N_{median_0} = \text{||| || | |} \quad (C.2)$$

---

Provides generic commands  $\circ$ ,  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ,  $\%$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\Omega$  which work both in text and maths mode.

[Lem & Kandel \(1984\)](#), [\(Lem & Kandel 1984\)](#), “`citep[see][page 45]Lem1984`” => (see [Lem & Kandel 1984](#), page 45)

included persons via citations: Volker Bothmer, Rainer Schwenn, Eckhard Bosman, Russel Howard, Manuela Temmer, Angelos Vourlidas, Craig DeForest, Tim Howard, Rodney Viereck

Style rules:

the Sun’s/solar rotation period

Earth’s/terrestrial

the Sun, sunspots; near-Sun measurements, near-relativistic electrons, in situ measurements without hyphen  
64 s data; but 64-second data

Therefore, a comma is set after certain adverbs at the beginning of a sentence.

lognormal or log-normal, not log normal

A&A style:

Italics should never be used for units

italics should be avoided for the following: mathematical signs such as “d” (total differential), “e” (base of natural logarithm), “i” (imaginary unit), “pi”

Physical constants such as the speed of light, the Boltzmann constant, the Hubble constant and the solar mass are also set in regular italics.

$$e^x = 10 \text{ km s}^{-1} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$e^x = 10 \text{ km}\cdot\text{s}^{-1} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$e^x = 10 \text{ km/s} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

$$k_B \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Sample input: 20 000 km, 1 000 000 s, HD 174 638 1950–1985, p. 11–21, this – written on a computer – is now printed, this—written on a computer—is now printed, signal-to-noise ratio, early-type, metal-poor, non-relativistic –30 K, –5 °C Dr. h.c. Rockefeller-Smith and Prof. Dr. Mallory

---

Nützliche Beispiele für LaTeX-Kommandos:

Autobahn

X-Ray

X-Ray

Dr. Huber

100 000 V

100 000 V

The food—which was delicious—reminded me of home.

Red, white, and blue—these are the colors of the flag.

$$U = 20\,000 \text{ V}$$

$$\text{solar radius: } R_\odot = 696\,000 \text{ km}$$

$$10 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$$

$$10 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$$

$$10 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$$

Ein Winkel von 10°.

$$\frac{T_D}{[\text{K}]} = 21,8 \cdot \left( \frac{\Delta v_{\text{FWHM}}^{\text{LMC}}}{[\text{km s}^{-1}]} \right)^2 \quad (\text{C.7})$$

$$\frac{T_D}{[\text{K}]} = 21,8 \cdot \left( \frac{\Delta v_{\text{FWHM}}^{\text{LMC}}}{[\text{km s}^{-1}]} \right)^2 \quad (\text{C.8})$$

$$k = 3.56 \text{ e-}6 \quad (\text{C.9})$$

$$k = 3.56 \cdot 10^{-6} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

$$k = 3.56 \times 10^{-6} \quad (\text{C.11})$$

### 1. CM LMC Longitude

drei CM LMC Latitude

Volume in  $(\text{°})^2 \text{m s}^{-1}$ . Summe aller Voxel des Objektes.

**Volume** in  $(\text{°})^2 \text{m s}^{-1}$ . Summe aller Voxel des Objektes.

- Volume

sdgffs CM GSR Velocity

label

asdf Volume

drei CM LMC Latitude

<sup>1</sup> oder <sup>2</sup>

$$a^2 + b^2 = c^2 \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Formel zitieren: (Siehe Formel C.12, Formel (C.12), Seite 96)

package siunitx:  
 $20.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ kg}$   
 $20.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ kg}$   
 $20.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ kg}$

width defines the width of the resulting box as seen from the outside (This means it can be **smaller** than the material inside the box. You can even set the width to 0pt so that the text inside the box will be typeset without influencing boxes). Besides the length expressions, you can also use

semi-log plots:  
log-lin: logarithmic scale on the y-axis, and a linear scale on the x-axis  
lin-log: logarithmic scale on the x-axis, and a linear scale on the y-axis  
the naming is output-input (y-x), the opposite order from (x, y)

my common language errors:  
hyphen for adjectives  
solar wind  
solar-wind parameters  
high-value tail

serial comma (it is an american thing and optional)  
a, b, c and d.  
a, b, c, and d.

comma if object is at beginning of sentence  
In the case of A, B is C.  
In order to A, B can C.

BE vs AE  
catalogue

---

<sup>1</sup>All listed websites were existent on 2008-09-15.

<sup>2</sup>All listed websites were existent on 2008-09-15.

---

catalog

grey  
gray