

Statistical Properties of Electron Curtain Precipitation Derived with AeroCube-6

M. Shumko¹, A.T. Johnson¹, J.G. Sample¹, D.L. Turner³, T.P. O'Brien², and
J.B. Blake²

¹Department of Physics, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, USA

²Space Science Applications Laboratory, The Aerospace Corporation, El Segundo, California USA

³Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, Maryland, USA

Key Points:

- We used the dual AeroCube-6 CubeSats to identify stationary, narrow, and persistent > 30 keV precipitation in low Earth orbit
- A single low Earth-orbiting spacecraft can easily misidentify curtains as microburst precipitation
- A few curtains were persistently scattered into the atmosphere for at least six seconds

Abstract

Curtains are recently discovered stationary, persistent, and narrow in latitude electron precipitation phenomena observed in low Earth orbit over sequential passes of the dual AeroCube-6 CubeSats. The > 30 keV electron curtains were stationary over a variety of spacecraft separations, observed by the follower spacecraft up to 65 seconds after the leader. This study expands the recent curtain discovery and quantifies statistical properties of 1634 curtains observed over three years. We found that in low Earth orbit, many curtains are narrower than 10 kilometers in latitude and 90% are less than 21 kilometers wide. We also found that curtains are an outer radiation belt phenomena that are observed in the late morning and midnight magnetic local time, with a higher occurrence rate at midnight. Furthermore curtains are observed more often at lower geomagnetic activity than microbursts. We compare every statistical result to microbursts to test the hypothesis that curtains are drifting remnants of microbursts. Lastly, we found a few curtains in the bounce loss cone region in the north Atlantic Ocean where drift mission is impossible. In one example, a curtain was continuously scattered for at least six seconds so curtains can be a significant source of > 30 keV electrons into the atmosphere.

1 Plain Language Summary

2 Introduction

Outline

1. Introduce various particle loss mechanisms
2. Introduce microbursts and their effect on atmospheric chemistry. Maybe mention how there is an unexplained source of HOX and NOX?
3. Introduce curtains and the prevailing hypothesis linking curtains to microbursts
4. If curtains are drifting then we have overestimated the atmospheric losses due to microbursts
5. Our goal is to study three statistical properties of curtains: location, spatial width, and preferred geomagnetic conditions. Lastly we will use the SAA to determine if some curtains were drifting around the Earth or locally and persistently precipitating
6. Explain DLC and BLC. DLC description from Comes 2003 paper and maybe something from Craig Rogers group.
7. Maybe cite the curtain paper from 2000 that relates them to lightning? Title: Trapped energetic electron curtains produced by thunderstorm driven relativistic runaway electrons

Curtains are a stationary electron precipitation phenomena observed in low Earth orbit (LEO). They are narrow in latitude, spiky, and appear stationary for up to a minute between subsequent satellite passes. Blake and O'Brien (2016) recently discovered curtains with the > 30 keV electron dosimeters onboard the dual AeroCube-6 (AC6) CubeSats that operated together between 2014 and 2017 and actively maintained in-track separation between a few hundred meters and a few hundred kilometers. Besides the Blake and O'Brien (2016) discovery study not much is known about curtains including what are they, how are they generated, their statistical properties, and their impact on the atmosphere. Answering these questions is an essential next step towards a more complete understanding of how curtains, and particle precipitation in general, affect the magnetosphere and Earth.

Recently developed multi-spacecraft missions, such as AC6, are necessary to identify and distinguish curtains from similar-looking transient precipitation called electron microbursts. Microbursts have been observed since mid 1960s by high altitude balloons and satellites and are also a spiky increase of electrons shorter than a second but are not

stationary (e.g. Anderson & Milton, 1964; Lorentzen et al., 2001; O’Brien et al., 2003; Douma et al., 2017). The impact of microbursts on the environment is substantial. Thorne et al. (2005), Douma et al. (2019), and Breneman et al. (2017)—among others—estimated that microbursts can deplete the outer radiation belt electrons in about a day. Furthermore, Seppälä et al. (2018) modeled a 6 hour microburst storm and concluded that microbursts depleted mesospheric ozone by roughly 10%. Thus, it is important to understand any connection between microbursts and curtains. Curtains and microbursts can be easily misidentified from a single spacecraft so we need to reevaluate single-satellite microburst studies. If curtains are numerous then the estimated occurrence rates and the microburst impact on the atmosphere and the outer radiation belt is overestimated.

Blake and O’Brien (2016) proposed the following hypothesis that explains curtain-microburst relationship. If a microburst is not completely lost in the atmosphere after the initial scatter, then the remaining microburst electrons will spread out (bounce phase average) along the entire magnetic field line. At the same time these electrons will drift to the east, with faster energy electrons drifting at a faster rate, so the initially localized microburst is smeared in longitude into the shape of a curtain.

This study expands the Blake and O’Brien (2016) study by estimating statistical properties of curtains and address the Blake and O’Brien (2016) hypothesis. We use approximately 1634 confirmed curtain observations to learn about the distributions of: the curtain width in latitude, the geomagnetic conditions favorable to curtains, curtain distribution in L and magnetic local time (MLT). Lastly we will test the hypothesis that curtains are drifting remnants of microbursts.

AC6 does not have the necessary pitch angle resolution to differentiate between drifting and precipitating electrons, instead we use AC6’s position and Earth’s asymmetric magnetic field to observe particles that are drifting or immediately lost. The spatial shift of Earth’s magnetic field creates a region of weaker magnetic field in the South Atlantic Ocean called the South Atlantic Anomaly (SAA). In LEO an observed particle with a local pitch angle, α , smaller than the local loss cone pitch angle, $\alpha_{lc} \approx 60^\circ$ will travel towards its mirror point at an altitude below 100 kilometers. At these altitudes collisions with the atmosphere are numerous and the particle is likely to be lost within one bounce period. Particles with $\alpha > \alpha_{lc}$ are not immediately lost, rather they are lost in the SAA once they drift into it (technically some particles observed in the SAA are trapped).

2.1 Curtain Hypothesis

Besides a brief description of curtains in Blake and O’Brien (2016), not much is known about about them. Blake and O’Brien (2016) proposed an outstanding hypothesis that curtains are remnants of microbursts that are not completely scattered into the atmosphere and over time the packet of microburst electrons is smeared out (bounce phase averaged) along the magnetic field line between the two hemispheres. Since different energy electrons drift around the Earth at different speeds, the electrons are not only smeared out along one field line, but also stretched out along the electron drift orbit into a curtain shape. In most regions in LEO where AC6 observes curtain electrons, these electrons are drifting east in the drift loss cone until they are scattered in the atmosphere in the South Atlantic Anomaly (SAA). The SAA is a region where Earth’s magnetic field is weakest near the surface, caused by the spatial offset of Earth’s magnetic field. A related region, magnetically conjugate to the SAA is the bounce loss cone (BLC). Traditionally, the BLC is defined as the North Atlantic region where if an electron is observed in LEO, it will either precipitate in the atmosphere below the spacecraft, or mirror at the spacecraft altitude and then potentially mirror at or below 100 km altitude in the SAA. At sub-100 kilometer altitude, collisions with the atmosphere are numerous and the particle will be lost. In this study we will assume this definition and a more strict

definition that the particle will mirror at or below sea level in the SAA—in other words the particle is surely lost.

The concept of the bounce loss cone (BLC) pitch angle is traditionally defined as the pitch angle of a particle that will mirror at or below 100 km where collisions with the atmosphere become more numerous and the particle is likely to be lost within one bounce period. The BLC pitch angle, however small, is always defined but most LEO spacecraft do not have the angular resolution to identify particles that will be immediately lost. A particle can also be pseudo-trapped if it has a pitch angle between the BLC and the drift loss cone. A particle with a pitch angle smaller than the drift loss cone and larger than the BLC will locally mirror above 100 km and drift around the Earth until the altitude of the mirror point magnetic field descends below 100 km in the SAA and the particle is lost. For pitch angles greater than the drift loss cone, the particle is considered trapped.

While AC6 does not have PA information, it is instructive to consider the affect of particle PA, on AC6 observations and if the particle is immediately lost. Assume the equatorial PA of electrons that mirror at AC6's altitude by α_0 . Then if an electron has $\alpha > \alpha_0$ then that electron may be trapped and will not be observed by AC6 in the BLC. The other condition, $\alpha < \alpha_0$ means that the electron will either precipitate bellow AC6 or mirror at an altitude bellow AC6 in the northern hemisphere and then bounce to the southern hemisphere and precipitate in the atmosphere.

Without the angular resolution necessary to study the particles in the BLC and DLC, the geographic location of the LEO spacecraft can be used to exclude certain particle populations. In the SAA, a LEO satellite observes particles all three particle motions: trapped, drifting in the DLC, or immediately lost. Outside of the SAA and the BLC a LEO spacecraft observes particles lost within one drift, or immediately. Lastly BLC region conjugate to the SAA only immediately precipitating particles are observed in LEO. For most locations outside of the SAA, a LEO spacecraft does not observe trapped particles and thus observes particles in the DLC and BLC. Those particles must be lost soon but the question remains if the particles are lost immediately or when they drift into the SAA. The region magnetically conjugate to the SAA in the north Atlantic ocean is also confusingly called the BLC. In the BLC region a particle either precipitates below the satellite, or mirror just below the satellite and precipitate in the SAA, where the particles mirror point in the SAAs reduced magnetic field strength is lower in the atmosphere. In other words, the electron will be lost to the atmosphere. Thus in the BLC region any observed particle is lost within a bounce period (1 second for 30 keV electrons). Since AC6 does not have angular resolution, BLC will only refer to the north Atlantic region.

OLD: I propose to test this question using Earths asymmetric magnetic field which creates a region of weaker magnetic field in the South Atlantic Anomaly (SAA). A related region, magnetically conjugate to the SAA in the North Atlantic, is the bounce loss cone (BLC). The BLC and the SAA are critical to test the proposed science question. A particle observed in LEO and in the BLC will precipitate within one bounce period (1 second for 35 keV electrons). The electron will either precipitate below the satellite, or mirror just below the satellite and travel into the SAA, where the particles mirror point in the SAAs reduced magnetic field strength is deep in the atmosphere. In other words, the electron will transfer its energy and be lost to the atmosphere.

3 Instrumentation

Think about the flow, and avoid plagiarizing myself

The AC6 mission was a pair of 0.5U (10x10x5 cm) CubeSats built by The Aerospace Corporation designed to measure the electron and proton environment in low Earth or-

bit (O’Brien et al., 2016). AC6 was launched on 19 June 2014 into a 620x700 km, 98° inclination orbit. The AC6 orbit over the three year mission lifetime was roughly dawn-dusk, and precessed only a few hours in MLT; 8-12 MLT in dawn and 20-24 MLT in dusk. The two AC6 spacecraft, designated as AC6-A and AC6-B, separated after launch and were in proximity for the duration of the three year mission—maintained by an active attitude control system. The attitude control system allowed then to precisely control the amount of atmospheric drag experienced by each AC6 unit using the surface area of their solar panel “wings”. By changing their orientation, AC6 was able to maintain a separation between 2-800 km, confirmed with the Global Positioning System. The two AC6 units were in a string of pearls configuration so one unit, typically unit A, was leading the other by an in-track lag—the time it would take the following spacecraft to catch up to the position of the leading spacecraft. To convert between the AC6 in-track separation and in-track lag, we assume a typical 7.5 km/s orbital velocity of LEO spacecraft. The in-track lag was readily available with the Global Positioning System which makes it easy to study precipitation phenomena observed at the same time, and at the same position by shifting one time series by the in-track lag.

Each AC6 unit contains three Aerospace microdosimeters (licensed to Teledyne Microelectronics, Inc) that measure the electron and proton dose in orbit (O’Brien et al., 2016). The dosimeter used for this study is dos1 with a 30 keV electron threshold. dos1 is used for this study because the other dosimeters were not identical between unit A and B. All dosimeters sample at 1 Hz in survey mode, and 10 Hz in burst mode. 10 Hz data was readily available from both AC6 units from June 2014 to May 2017 while their in-track lag was less than 65 seconds, and at times was a fraction of a second. **Show a distribution of the in-track lag when they had 10 Hz data?** The variety of AC6 separations and data availability over the three-year mission makes it possible to study transient electron microburst precipitation (Shumko et al., 2019) and now stationary electron curtain precipitation.

4 Methodology

4.1 Curtain Identification

Outline

1. Various parameters were explored and we tuned it to have as many candidate events as possible while being feasible to inspect every detection.
2. Baseline sensitivity decreases with larger structures, depending on the curtain amplitude, background level, and baseline width. Sensitivity begins to rapidly diminish for widths close to half of the baseline width—around five seconds, correspondent to 38 km size, for this identification criteria.

The 10 Hz data was used to identify curtains with the following two criteria: a high spatial correlation, and **bursty**. The first criterion quantifies the similarity of the feature between both AC6 units, and the second criterion checks that highly correlated times were **bursty**. Before we we applied the identification criteria, the AC6-B time series was shifted by the in-track lag to spatially align it with the AC6-A time series.

The first identification criterion is a 1-second rolling Pearson correlation applied to both time series. Spatial features with a correlation greater than 0.8 were considered highly correlated and saved.

The second identification criterion checks for locations where both AC6 units observed **bursty** precipitation. Similar to how precipitation bands were identified in Blum et al. (2015) and microbursts in Greeley et al. (2019), we find **bursty** precipitation by estimating the number of Poisson standard deviations, σ , that a dos1 count rate is above




Figure 1. Four examples showing the AC6 > 30 keV electron data taken by AC6 at the same time in the top row and at the same position in the bottom row. AC6-A, whose data is shown with red curves, was s kilometers ahead of AC6-B. To show the data at the same position the time series data from one spacecraft was shifted by the in-track lag and annotated by dt . These examples show curtain precipitation that was highly correlated for up to 26 seconds.

a centered 10-second running average, B_{10} . Locations where the count rates are at least two σ above B_{10} are bursty.

The locations where the two criteria are met are curtain candidates and the time of the peak count rates are saved. To check the quality of the data set, one author visually checked every candidate curtain and 1634 curtains were confirmed. Four curtain examples are shown in Fig. 1. In these examples the unmodified time series is in the top row and the corresponding spatially-aligned time series is in the bottom row. The in-track lag used to shift the bottom row is annotated by dt , corresponding to an AC6 in-track separation annotated by s . The top row is uncorrelated; thus these events were not microbursts. The bottom row is correlated after 3 to 26 seconds. The correlated curtains in the bottom row are peculiar—they have a fine structure on a 10-kilometer scale that we have shown to persist for at least 26 seconds.

5 Results

Outline

1. Show curtain width and comment how narrow they are. Whether they are drifting or locally precipitating, they must have a very filamentary structure that persists for multiple seconds
2. Figure out how the detection bias affects the width distribution
3. Show, and comment on the Auroral electrojet strengths when each curtain was observed. Curtains are more likely to be observed during disturbed times.
4. Discuss the SAA, BLC, and show the curtains the the BLC plot. Mention how these electrons must have been precipitating for multiple seconds, over an order of magnitude longer than typical microbursts.

In the spirit of brevity, we limited the scope of this statistical study to answer three questions:

1. how narrow are curtains,
2. when and where are curtains observed, and

3. are curtains drifting or locally precipitating?

For each of these questions we will compare the curtain distribution against the > 30 keV microburst distribution from Shumko et al. (2019). Then we will provide observational evidence that suggests that some curtain electrons are continuously scattered and can not be drifting.

5.1 Curtain Width

We quantified curtain width in time as the width at half of the curtain's topographic prominence: the height of the peak above the lowest contour that encircles the peak but contains no higher peak. The spatial width of a curtain is the product of the temporal width and the 7.5 km/s orbital velocity mostly in latitude. The distribution of curtain widths is shown in Fig. 2 by the thick black curve. Curtains are very narrow in latitude. Many curtains are less than 10 km wide, and 90% are narrower than 21 km.

We compared the curtain width distribution to the microburst size distribution estimated in Shumko et al. (2019). Shumko et al. (2019) estimated the microburst size distribution by finding microbursts that were observed simultaneously by both AC6 units so the microburst size much be larger than the AC6 separation. The red curve in Fig. 2 shows the microburst distribution estimated from the ratio of the number of concurrent and nonconcurrent microbursts observed in each separation bin.

The curtain and microburst size distributions are very similar with a one notable difference. Curtain widths are observed directly hence their distribution is peaked, while the microburst distribution is estimated from concurrent observations so their distribution is peaked at 0 km AC6 separation. **What about the geometric arguments that push the microburst size higher?**

5.2 When and Where Are Curtains Observed

The distribution of curtains in L and MLT is shown in Fig. 3. Figure 3a shows the distribution of the 1634 observed curtains and Fig. 3b shows the normalized distribution. The white bins, mostly in the early morning and evening MLT regions, had no observed curtains because the AC6 orbit did not sample there. Figure 3c confirms this by showing the distribution of the number of quality (data quality flag = 0) 10 Hz samples.

After scaling by the uneven sampling in the late morning and midnight MLT regions, the normalized distribution in Fig. 3b shows enhanced curtain occurrence in the outer radiation belt, and in late morning and midnight MLT regions. The highest curtain occurrence rates are near midnight MLT, in contrast to microbursts peak occurrence rates in the late morning MLT (e.g. O'Brien et al., 2003; Douma et al., 2017). **Has anyone ever made a L-MLT distribution of low energy microbursts? Most studies that I remember studied 1 MeV microbursts with SAMPEX.**

Now we quantify the geomagnetic conditions favorable for curtains. Figure 4 shows the distribution of the Auroral Electroject (AE) index between 2014 and 2017, and the distribution of the AE index when curtains and microbursts were observed. The microburst distribution is from Shumko et al. (2019). Curtains are observed during relatively active times, similar to microbursts, but microbursts typically occur at relatively elevated AE compared to curtains. **The microburst peak occurrence rates during quiet times are in the midnight MLT, since curtains are often observed at low geomagnetic conditions in the midnight MLT, some of the events at midnight MLT in the prior microburst studies (e.g. Douma et al., 2017) may have been curtains.**




Figure 2. Size distributions of curtains (AC6 in-track separation mostly in latitude) in black and microbursts in red as a function of AC6 in-track width. Microburst distribution adopted from Shumko et al. (2019).




Figure 3. Distribution of observed curtains as a function of L and MLT in panel a and normalized number of curtains in panel b. Panel c shows the number of quality 10 Hz samples taken at the same time that was used to normalize panel b. The white bins in panels a have 0 curtain observations. In panel b the white shaded bins had either 0 detections or very little 10 Hz samples (less than 10,000).




Figure 4. The distribution of the Auroral Electrojet (AE) index from 2014 to 2017. The black curve shows the distribution for the entire 2014-2017 AE data set, the dotted blue curve shows the AE distribution for curtains, and the dashed green curve shows AE the distribution for microbursts studied in Shumko et al. (2019).




Figure 5. Curtains observed inside the bounce loss cone. [Reference Comess 2013 and DIETRICH 2010 paper that shows a similar BLC region.](#)

284 5.3 Local Atmospheric Precipitation

285 6 Discussion

286 Outline

- 287 1. Curtains are spatially small and must be around a few hundred km at the equa-
288 tor
- 289 2. curtain phenomena originates in the outer radiation belt, and observed relatively
290 more in the evening than morning regions. Limited AC6 coverage prevents a com-
291 plete MLT distribution
- 292 3. preference to disturbed conditions
- 293 4. To explain the randomness in the leading/following spacecraft count rates. If cur-
294 tains are microburst remnants and the microburst electrons were recently scat-
295 tered, then those electrons are not yet mixed homogeneously among the field line.
296 With AC6 the leading and trailing spacecraft will observe a part of the spread out
297 packet. Assuming the microburst had a falling energy spectrum, the leading space-
298 craft could see a smaller number of higher energy electrons, or a higher number
299 of low energy electrons.
- 300 5. some curtains locally precipitate for an extended period of time so there must be
301 a sustained parallel electric field. Show the derivation and estimated potential.
- 302 6. AC6 can't answer this question, but curtains could provide a substantial source
303 of HOx and NOx molecules responsible for destroying ozone. We need AC6 with
304 energy and pitch angle resolution.

305 7 Conclusions

306 Acknowledgments

307 This work was made possible with the help from the many engineers and scientists at
308 The Aerospace Corporation who designed, built, and operated AC6. M. Shumko was sup-
309 ported by NASA Headquarters under the NASA Earth and Space Science Fellowship Pro-
310 gram - Grant 80NSSC18K1204. D.L. Turner is thankful for support from the Van Allen
311 Probes mission and a NASA grant (Prime award number: 80NSSC19K0280). The work
312 at The Aerospace Corporation was supported in part by RBSP-ECT funding provided
313 by JHU/APL contract 967399 under NASA's Prime contract NAS501072. The AC6 data
314 is available at <http://rbspgway.jhuapl.edu/ac6> and the IRBEM-Lib version used for this
315 analysis can be downloaded from <https://sourceforge.net/p/irbem/code/616/tree/>.

316 8 Homeless Words

317 Title: Statistical Properties of Curtains–Latitudinally-Narrow and Persistent Elec-
318 tron Precipitation Phenomena

319 This study leverages AC6, a multi-spacecraft mission, to interpret and understand
320 particle precipitation in a way that is impossible with a single spacecraft.

321 This study leverages the asymmetry in Earth's magnetic field. The asymmetric mag-
322 netic field results in the SAA and the BLC, two very related and unique regions

323 Particles that impact the atmosphere are lost during that bounce motion. We found
324 curtains in the bounce loss cone, a region in the North Atlantic near and above Iceland.

325 The bounce loss cone is magnetically connected to the SAA, where Earth's mag-
326 netic field is weakest near Earth's surface. A particle observed in the blc in the north-

ern hemisphere will descend below 100 km altitude. At sub-100 km altitudes the particle has a high chance of encountering and scattering with the atmosphere and be lost.

We found curtain electrons that, when given the chance to execute their cyclical bounce motion, will descend below Earth's surface in the SAA. An electrons can not survive that trip.

Write the paper and ask the question: "What is this paper really about?" Not just curtains, but uncovering something unexpected that has been observed and overlooked for decades.

Are curtains related to aurora? This is a good question—one that is not pertinent here (idea from The Elements of Style p.68).

Here are two parting questions that are not considered here. Why were some curtains shifted slightly? Perhaps it was due to the movement of the magnetic field lines. Also do curtains have a corresponding visual signature on the ground? The answer to this question will show if curtains are related to the aurora.

References

- Anderson, K. A., & Milton, D. W. (1964). Balloon observations of X rays in the auroral zone: 3. High time resolution studies. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 69(21), 4457–4479. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/JZ069i021p04457> doi: 10.1029/JZ069i021p04457
- Blake, J. B., & O'Brien, T. P. (2016). Observations of small-scale latitudinal structure in energetic electron precipitation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 121(4), 3031–3035. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015JA021815> (2015JA021815) doi: 10.1002/2015JA021815
- Blum, L., Li, X., & Denton, M. (2015). Rapid MeV electron precipitation as observed by SAMPEX/HILT during high-speed stream-driven storms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 120(5), 3783–3794. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014JA020633> (2014JA020633) doi: 10.1002/2014JA020633
- Breneman, A., Crew, A., Sample, J., Klumpar, D., Johnson, A., Agapitov, O., ... others (2017). Observations directly linking relativistic electron microbursts to whistler mode chorus: Van allen probes and FIREBIRD II. *Geophysical Research Letters*.
- Douma, E., Rodger, C., Blum, L., O'Brien, T., Clilverd, M., & Blake, J. (2019). Characteristics of relativistic microburst intensity from sampex observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*.
- Douma, E., Rodger, C. J., Blum, L. W., & Clilverd, M. A. (2017). Occurrence characteristics of relativistic electron microbursts from SAMPEX observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 122(8), 8096–8107. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2017JA024067> (2017JA024067) doi: 10.1002/2017JA024067
- Greeley, A., Kanekal, S., Baker, D., Klecker, B., & Schiller, Q. (2019). Quantifying the contribution of microbursts to global electron loss in the radiation belts. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*.
- Lorentzen, K. R., Blake, J. B., Inan, U. S., & Bortnik, J. (2001). Observations of relativistic electron microbursts in association with VLF chorus. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 106(A4), 6017–6027. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2000JA003018> doi: 10.1029/2000JA003018
- O'Brien, T. P., Blake, J. B., & W., G. J. (2016, May). *Aerocube-6 dosimeter data readme* (Tech. Rep. No. TOR-2016-01155). The Aerospace Corporation.
- O'Brien, T. P., Lorentzen, K. R., Mann, I. R., Meredith, N. P., Blake, J. B., Fen-

- 377 nell, J. F., ... Anderson, R. R. (2003). Energization of relativistic elec-
 378 trons in the presence of ULF power and MeV microbursts: Evidence for dual
 379 ULF and VLF acceleration. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*,
 380 108(A8). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2002JA009784> doi:
 381 10.1029/2002JA009784
- 382 Seppälä, A., Douma, E., Rodger, C., Verronen, P., Clilverd, M. A., & Bortnik, J.
 383 (2018). Relativistic electron microburst events: Modeling the atmospheric
 384 impact. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45(2), 1141–1147.
- 385 Shumko, M., Johnson, A., Sample, J., Griffith, B. A., Turner, D. L., O’Brien, T. P.,
 386 ... Claudepierre, S. G. (2019). Electron microburst size distribution de-
 387 rived with aerocube-6. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*,
 388 e2019JA027651.
- 389 Thorne, R. M., O’Brien, T. P., Shprits, Y. Y., Summers, D., & Horne, R. B. (2005).
 390 Timescale for MeV electron microburst loss during geomagnetic storms. *Jour-
 391 nal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 110(A9). Retrieved from [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2004JA010882)
 392 dx.doi.org/10.1029/2004JA010882 (A09202) doi: 10.1029/2004JA010882