

# Application of Empirical Mode Decomposition of cosmic ray in prediction of great geomagnetic storms

Cong Wang<sup>1</sup>, Qian Ye<sup>1</sup>, BingSen Xue<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Key Laboratory for Space Weather, National Center for Space Weather, Beijing 100029, China

## Key Points:

- Great geomagnetic storms
- Empirical Mode Decomposition
- Cosmic ray
- Prediction

---

Corresponding author: Cong Wang, wangcong@cma.gov.cn

## Abstract

[ enter your Abstract here ]

## 1 Introduction

Geomagnetic storms are extreme space weather events that are generally thought to be caused by the interaction between the southward component of the interplanetary magnetic field in the solar wind and the earth's magnetosphere (Liu & Wan, 2014). Great geomagnetic storms ( $K_p \geq 7$ ) could affect satellites, aircrafts, VLF signal propagation and electric potential of power distribution network (Dorman, 2005; Starodubtsev et al., 2019; Liu & Wan, 2014). Meanwhile, great geomagnetic storms can also affect the ionosphere (Kravtsova & Sdobnov, 2016; Mandrikova et al., 2018), magnetosphere (Manninen et al., 2008) and even hurt passengers on airplanes. Hence, the prediction before the sudden commencement of the great geomagnetic storms is very important to prevent these negative effect.

Cosmic rays observed on Earth's surface were modulated by Earth's magnetic, the inhomogeneous magnetic field of the sun and the solar wind (Mandrikova et al., 2018; Kravtsova & Sdobnov, 2016). Due to the influence of these factors, the features of the cosmic ray flux and anisotropy contain information about the disturbance of interplanetary space (Belov et al., 2003; Kichigin et al., 2017), which hidden in the recurrent and sporadic (mainly caused by coronal mass ejections (CMEs)) variation of cosmic ray. Through statistical analysis, Zhang et al. (2007) noted that most of Major Geomagnetic Storms (60%), which occurred between 1996 and 2005, were associated with a single CME at the sun, and 27 percent of Major Geomagnetic Storms were associated multiple CMEs. Shi et al. (2014) investigated all moderate and strong geomagnetic storms between 2007 and 2012, and obtained similar result. Therefore, extracting the disturbance information caused by CMEs from cosmic ray intensity observed on the Earth ground could predict great geomagnetic storms in advance.

Many authors have studied to predicted great geomagnetic storms by analyzing cosmic ray data (Dorman, 1999; Munakata et al., 2000; Kudela et al., 2001; Dorman, 2005; Xue, 2007; Zhu et al., 2015). Dorman (1999) presented that the great magnetic storms accompanied by cosmic ray Forbush-effects could be predicted by analysing cosmic ray data. Subsequent, Munakata et al. (2000) firstly systematically investigated cosmic ray precursors of geomagnetic storms. They statisticed and analyzed 14 major geomagnetic storm and 25 large geomagnetic storms observed from 1992 to 1998, and noted that cosmic ray precursors will appears 6–9 hours ahead to the large geomagnetic storms. Thought analysing online one-hour cosmic ray intensity, Dorman (2005) suggested that the Forbush-decrease in cosmic ray could be used for predicting strong geomagnetic storms 10 to 15 hours in advance. In forecasting practice, Xue (2007) used the deviation between the cosmic ray flux in 8h and the average flux in this period to reflect the cosmic ray fluctuations, and tested this algorithm with data of whole year 2001. The final indicated that the accuracy rate of this algorithm was 80% and the error rate was 20%. Zhu et al. (2015) employed morlet wavelet to extract the abnormal fluctuations of cosmic ray before great geomagnetic storms, and advanced the forecast of great geomagnetic storms caused by CMEs to more than 12h.

To extracting the sporadic variation from cosmic ray flux, we used Empirical Mode Decomposes (EMD) to analyze cosmic ray intensity of oulu station. EMD is a key part of Hilbert-Huang transform (Huang et al., 1998), which could decompose the nonstationary nonlinear signal into a finite set of intrinsic mod function (IMF) and a trend (Barnhart & Eichinger, 2011). Nonstationary nonlinear signal could be clearly divided into quasi-periodic oscillatory signal and superimposed random background signal by using EMD (Kolotkov et al., 2016). EMD has been widely in sapce weather because of its powerfull ability of decomposition which is based on the local characteristic timescale of the data (Coughlin

& Tung, 2004; Barnhart & Eichinger, 2011; K  pyl  , M. J. et al., 2016; Cho et al., 2016; Kolotkov et al., 2016; Stangalini et al., 2014; Xiang & Qu, 2016).

In the present paper, we use EMD to extract the random background signal of the cosmic ray intensity, which caused by CME. These random background signals contain the information about the disturbance of interplanetary space caused by CME, and will arrive the earth before CME.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Overview

Cosmic ray(CR) contain a lot of information, about sunspots in the long run and diurnal variations in the short run. Shocks driven by energetic coronal mass ejections (CME's) and other interplanetary (IP) transients are mainly responsible for initiating large and intense geo- magnetic storms. Observational results indicate that galactic cosmic rays (GR) coming from deep surface interact with these abnormal solar and interplanetary conditions and suffer modulation effects. Most of the events are associated with transient decreases in cosmic ray intensity. Intense storms are having their well defined solar origin as during solar maximum the occurrence rate is 55% while it is only 45% during solar minimum phase of solar cycle.

Traditional signal processing methods can be divided into time-domain method and frequency-domain method. E

### 2.2 Empirical Module Decomposition and Ensemble Empirical Module Decomposition

EMD is a Vibration signals carrying a lot of information about the mechanical equipment health condition are frequently applied to monitor the machine health condition. The vibration signal decomposition is a critical step in machine health monitoring and fault diagnosis [1–3]. The methods to decompose vibration sensor signal mainly include FFT, wavelet transform, and EMD [4]. Among these methods, the FFT is one of the most widely used and well-established methods. However, there are some crucial restrictions on the use of Fourier transform. On the one hand, the FFT is a typical linear and stationary transform, which is not suitable for nonstationary signal analysis. On the other hand, it is suitable for global signal analysis instead of local signal analysis. Unfortunately, the vibration signals to be analyzed are often nonstationary and nonlinear especially under time-varying operational conditions. Hence, the FFT cannot fully fulfill the requirements of health monitoring and fault diagnosis. Recently, wavelet transform has become one of the most powerful signal processing tools on nonstationary signal decomposition [5–11]. Detailed descriptions of the existing research on application of the wavelet transform in machine condition monitoring and fault diagnostics are reviewed in Ref. [12]. In 1998, Huang et al. introduced the EMD method for analyzing data from nonstationary and nonlinear processes, which is based

### 2.3 Complete Ensemble Empirical Module Decomposition

## Acknowledgments

Enter acknowledgments, including your data availability statement, here.

## References

Barnhart, B. L., & Eichinger, W. E. (2011, Apr 01). Analysis of sunspot variability using the hilbert–huang transform. *Solar Physics*, 269(2), 439–449. Re-

- trieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11207-010-9701-6> doi: 10.1007/s11207-010-9701-6
- Belov, A. V., Bieber, J. W., Eroshenko, E. A., Evenson, P., Pyle, R., & Yankee, V. G. (2003). Cosmic ray anisotropy before and during the passage of major solar wind disturbances. *Advances in Space Research*, 31(4), 919-924.
- Cho, I.-H., Cho, K.-S., Nakariakov, V. M., Kim, S., & Kumar, P. (2016, oct). COMPARISON OF DAMPED OSCILLATIONS IN SOLAR AND STELLAR x-RAY FLARES. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 830(2), 110. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3847/2F0004-637x/2F830%2F2%2F110> doi: 10.3847/0004-637x/830/2/110
- Coughlin, K. T., & Tung, K. K. (2004). 11-year solar cycle in the stratosphere extracted by the empirical mode decomposition method. *Advances in Space Research*, 34(2), 323-329.
- Dorman, L. I. (1999). Cosmic ray forrush-decreases as indicators of space dangerous phenomena and possible use of cosmic ray data for their prediction. *Proc Icre*, 6.
- Dorman, L. I. (2005). Space weather and dangerous phenomena on the earth: principles of great geomagnetic storms forecasting by online cosmic ray data. *Annales Geophysicae*, 23(9), 2997-3002. Retrieved from <https://www.ann-geophys.net/23/2997/2005/> doi: 10.5194/angeo-23-2997-2005
- Huang, N. E., Shen, Z., Long, S. R., Wu, M. C., Shih, H. H., Zheng, Q., ... Liu, H. H. (1998). The empirical mode decomposition and the hilbert spectrum for nonlinear and non-stationary time series analysis. *Proceedings: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 454(1971), 903-995. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/53161>
- Kichigin, G., Kravtsova, M., & Sdobnov, V. (2017). Parameters of current systems in the magnetosphere as derived from observations of cosmic rays during the june 2015 magnetic storm. *Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 3, 13-17.
- Kolotkov, D. Y., Anfinogentov, S. A., & Nakariakov, V. M. (2016). Empirical mode decomposition analysis of random processes in the solar atmosphere. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 592, A153.
- Kravtsova, M. V., & Sdobnov, V. E. (2016). Cosmic rays during great geomagnetic storms in cycle 23 of solar activity. *Geomagnetism & Aeronomy*, 56(2), 143-150.
- Kudela, K., Storini, M., Antalová, A., & Rybák, J. (2001). On the wavelet approach to cosmic ray variability..
- Käpylä, M. J., Käpylä, P. J., Olsper, N., Brandenburg, A., Warnecke, J., Karak, B. B., & Pelt, J. (2016). Multiple dynamo modes as a mechanism for long-term solar activity variations. *A&A*, 589, A56. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201527002> doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201527002
- Liu, L. B., & Wan, W. X. (2014). A brief overview on the issue on space physics and space weather. *Chinese Journal of Geophysics*, 57(11), 3493-3501.
- Mandrikova, O., Polozov, Y., Fetisova, N., & Zalyaev, T. (2018). Analysis of the dynamics of ionospheric parameters during periods of increased solar activity and magnetic storms. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 181, 116 - 126. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364682618301500> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2018.10.019>
- Manninen, J., Kleimenova, N. G., Kozyreva, O. V., Ranta, A., Kauristie, K., Mäkinen, S., & Kornilova, T. A. (2008). Ground-based observations during the period between two strong november 2004 storms attributed to steady magnetospheric convection. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 113(A3). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2007JA012984> doi: 10.1029/2007JA012984
- Munakata, K., Bieber, J. W., Yasue, S. I., Kato, C., Koyama, M., Akahane, S., ...

- 159 Duldig, M. L. (2000). Precursors of geomagnetic storms observed by the muon  
160 detector network. *Journal of Geophysical Research Space Physics*, 105(A12),  
161 27457-27468.
- 162 Shi, L. W., Shen, C. L., & Wang, Y. M. (2014). The interplanetary origins of ge-  
163 omagnetic storm with dstmin  $\geq$  -50 nt in 2007-2012. *Chinese Journal of Geo-*  
164 *physics*, 57(11), 3822-3833.
- 165 Stangalini, M., Consolini, G., Berrilli, F., Michelis, P. D., & Tozzi, R. (2014). Obser-  
166 vational evidence for buffeting induced kink waves in solar magnetic elements.  
167 *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 569.
- 168 Starodubtsev, S., Baishev, D., Grigoryev, V., Karimov, R., Kozlov, V., Korsakov,  
169 A., ... Moiseev, A. (2019). Analyzing solar, cosmic, and geophysical events  
170 in september 2017 using shicra sb ras complex observations. *Solar-Terrestrial*  
171 *Physics*, 5, 14-27.
- 172 Xiang, N. B., & Qu, Z. N. (2016, feb). ENSEMBLE EMPIRICAL MODE DE-  
173 COMPOSITION OF THE MAGNETIC FIELD OF THE SUN AS a STAR.  
174 *The Astronomical Journal*, 151(3), 76. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.3847/2F0004-6256/2F151/2F3/2F76)  
175 [10.3847/0004-6256/151/3/76](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-6256/151/3/76) doi: 10.3847/0004-6256/151/3/76
- 176 Xue, B. (2007). Preliminary attempt in prediction the geomagnetic storm with  
177 ground cosmic ray data. *Chinese Journal of Space Science*, 27(3), 218-222.
- 178 Zhang, J., Richardson, I., Webb, D. F., Gopalswamy, N., Huttunen, E., Kasper, J.,  
179 ... Wu, C. C. (2007). Solar and interplanetary sources of major geomagnetic  
180 storms (dst less than or equal to -100 nt) during 1996 - 2005. *Sociology &*  
181 *Anthropology*.
- 182 Zhu, X. L., Xue, B. S., Cheng, G. S., & Cang, Z. Y. (2015). Application of wavelet  
183 analysis of cosmic ray in prediction of great geomagnetic storms. *Chinese*  
184 *Journal of Geophysics*, 58(7), 2242-2249.