On the seasonal and solar cycle variation of the ULF fluctuations at low latitudes: A comparison with the ionospheric parameters
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ABSTRACT

A long term analysis (1996–2015) of the occurrence and characteristics of the wave events (Pc3; f = 20–100 mHz; H and D component), detected at a low latitude ground-based station (L’Aquila, Italy), and the comparison with the ionospheric parameters reveal some interesting aspects of their seasonal and solar cycle variation. In general, the daytime wave activity, which basically consists of penetrating upstream waves and, at higher frequencies, of resonances of local field lines, appears more intense (with a more relevant percentage of D events) in winter than in summer, suggesting a seasonal dependence of the attenuation and rotation of the downgoing signal through the ionosphere and, during winter, less efficient ionospheric conditions for the onset of resonance processes (typically occurring along the H component). This situation persists during solar minima, while, during solar maxima, the summer occurrence rate of events exceeds the winter one: this aspect might be related to the more frequent impact on the magnetosphere of energetic solar wind structures during solar maxima; in summer, given the favourable ionospheric conditions, they might determine a much more frequent manifestation of relevant resonance events. Rapidly increasing after midnight, the wave activity reveals a pre-sunrise peak followed by a minimum, on average coincident with the f0f2 minimum, and the winter pattern appears to be delayed ∼1 h compared to the summer one.

1. Introduction

Long term analysis of the occurrence and characteristics of relevant wave events in the mid-frequency ULF range (f ≈ 10–100 mHz; reviews by Villante, 2007; Menk, 2013), conducted at a low latitude ground-based station (L’Aquila, AQ, Italy, geomagnetic coordinates λ ≈ 36.1° N, φ ≈ 87.0° E; L ≈ 1.6; LT = UT +1; Villante and Tiberi, 2015; Villante and Tiberi, 2016), evidenced that these fluctuations mostly occur between dawn and noon, in the Pc3 band (f ≈ 22–100 mHz); they typically manifest, as almost regular, long-living waveforms, propagating antisunward, ultimately related to upstream waves generated in foreshock region. Several channels for the propagation to the ground of these fluctuations have been proposed (review by Olson and Fraser, 1994): direct propagation of compressional waves through the magnetosheath and the magnetosphere; penetration at the cusp; coupling to an evanescent mode at the plasmapause, and others. Transported across the dayside magnetosphere as fast magnetosonic modes, the waves partially convert their energy into standing Alfvén waves, where the frequency of the incoming wave matches the frequency of the local field line; consequently, the wave modes manifest also as resonances of local field lines (FLRs; standing waves on field lines with fixed ends on conjugate hemispherical points). In the magnetosphere, the upstream waves are mostly compressional and the FLRs mostly toroidal. The wave characteristics modify across the ionosphere: the fast modes do not experience any absorption at nightside and are weakly absorbed at dayside; the absorption of the Alfvén waves is expected to be low at dayside, significantly increasing at nightside (Pilipenko et al., 2008). In addition, a ∼90° rotation of the polarization ellipse across the ionosphere is expected only for the toroidal component; so, both the upstream waves and the FLRs would show up mostly along the H component (north–south) on the ground. On the other hand, the coupling between modes may result in an Alfvén wave with a poloidal component and the actual amount of rotation of the polarization ellipses may differ from the predicted one (Heilig et al., 2013); in addition, since the signals detected at ground-based stations are integrated over a large area of the ionosphere, they might have mixed contributions from the Alfvén wave and from the
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fast mode: as a matter of fact, clear evidence for ULF waves is routinely detected in ground-based measurements also along the D component (east/west). Much less frequent, impulsive, damped oscillations, ultimately related to the substorms onset, occur during the night (Pi2; \( f \approx 6-25 \) mHz; Kelling and Takahashi, 2011).

Some aspects of the analysis conducted by Villante and Tiberi (2015) and Villante and Tiberi (2016) suggested long term and seasonal modulations of the wave occurrence and characteristics: these features are more deeply analysed in the present paper in which the aspects of the wave manifestation are compared with measurements performed at the ionospheric station of Rome (\( \lambda \approx 42.0^\circ \), \( \varphi \approx 93.8^\circ \)) by means of an AIS-INGV ionosonde (Zuccheretti et al., 2003) and validated by using the Interpre software (Pezzopane, 2004).

### 2. The event identification

For the scopes of the present investigation, we examined almost twenty years of data (March 1996–December 2015) collected at AQU, encompassing the solar cycle 23 (1996–2008) and a major portion of the solar cycle 24, with several data gaps (the largest occurring between January–June 2012 and between October 2014–February 2015): in the period of interest, the solar maxima occurred approximately at November 2001 and April 2014, respectively; a prolonged deep minimum, during \( \approx 2008-2009 \), was characterized by a decrease of \( \approx 15\% \) in the EUV solar radiation with respect to the previous one (Chen et al., 2011, 2012; Perna and Pezzopane, 2016).

The details of the data analysis, power spectra evaluation and event identification have been extensively discussed by Villante and Tiberi (2015); here, we simply remind that, during less active periods (i.e. \( Kp<5, Dst>-100 \)), the dominant peak is identified, in the 5 min spectra
of the H and D component, with a spectral resolution of 4 mHz in the frequency range $f = 10-100$ mHz; this peak is then selected as relevant "event" if the signal to noise ratio exceeds a given threshold $T$ (different for H and D, given the greater amplitude of H events). In practise, we selected a large number of events over the entire period (namely, $N_D = 50,888$ and $N_H = 50,841$; with H events more energetic). Obviously, the event identification is influenced by the magnetospheric conditions in that sharp, narrow band peaks more rarely emerge in the power spectra during more active periods. In the following, we consider the hourly occurrence rates, $R_H$ and $R_D$ (the ratios between the number of events and the number of available 5 min intervals in each hour), their ratio $R_{HD} = R_H/R_D$ and the total occurrence rate $R_T = R_H + R_D$ (counting

Fig. 2. The 13-months running averages of several parameters. From the top: the sunspots number ($<S>_{13}$, panel a), the solar wind speed ($<V_{sw}>_{13}$, panel b), the interplanetary magnetic field strength ($<B_{IMF}>_{13}$, panel c), the total occurrence rate of events ($<R_T>_{13}$, panel d), the relative occurrence ($<R_{HD}>_{13}$, panel e); the 13-months medians of the daytime values of the ionospheric parameters ($<foF2>_{13}$, panel f) and ($<foE>_{13}$, panel g).
once the events simultaneously identified in both components); the ionospheric conditions are represented by the hourly validated values of the F2-layer and E-layer critical frequencies, namely $f_{o}F_2$ and $f_{o}E$, both related to the corresponding electron densities through the well-known relationship $f_{o} = \frac{N}{(1.24 \times 10^4)^{1/2}}$, where $f_{o}$ is the frequency in MHz and $N$ the electron density in $\text{el/cm}^3$. Ionospheric data were downloaded from the electronic Space Weather upper atmosphere database of INGV (http://www.eswua.ingv.it; Romano et al., 2008).

3. The characteristics of the ULF activity

The occurrence and characteristics (practically the same discussed by Villante and Tiberi, 2015 and Villante and Tiberi, 2016) of the events selected over the entire period are summarized in Fig. 1. Briefly, a major fraction of the events have frequencies between $f \approx 26–46$ mHz ("upstream band"; Fig. 1a) and basically consist of penetrating upstream waves influencing both components; at higher frequencies, the percentages of the H events exceed the D ones, particularly between $f \approx 54–74$ mHz ("resonance band") and reflect the occurrence of FLRs, mostly influencing the H component: at our station, indeed, during the preceding solar cycle (1985–1994; Vellante et al., 1996), the resonance frequency was found to vary approximately between $f \approx 60–90$ mHz, with lower frequencies at solar maximum. Actually, the FLRs influence, at some extent, also the D component (Heilig et al., 2013); however, the

Fig. 3. a) The frequency distribution of the selected events (D component, blue; H component, red) during high solar wind velocity intervals. <$V_{SW}$>, <$R_{D}$> and <$R_{H}$> are the average SW velocity and occurrence rates during high and low velocity intervals, respectively. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)
corresponding enhancements rarely emerge as dominant peaks in the power spectra. As a matter of fact, while the selected D events are mostly related to the upstream waves, the H events are a mixture of upstream waves (in general, much more numerous) and FLRs. The LT dependence of the occurrence rates (Fig. 1b) confirms the ULF activity mostly as a dayside phenomenon, with highest rates between \( \approx 08 \) and 10 LT \( (R_D) \) and between \( \approx 09 \) and 12 LT \( (R_H) \); the wave activity declines in the afternoon and rarely occurs in the pre-midnight sector \( (\approx 21–24 \text{ LT}) \). The average rates are quite relevant between \( \approx 04 \) and 07 LT, a sector practically delimited by the LT excursion of the dawn terminator during the year (the dashed green lines in Fig. 1b delimit the estimated LT ranges of the dawn and dusk terminator at 100 km of altitude during winter; the dotted red lines delimit those of the terminator at 250 km of altitude). Note also that, in general, the selected D events are predominant with respect to H events between \( \approx 03 \) and 09 LT while the opposite situation occurs in the afternoon. On average, the ratio between the after-sunrise and the pre-sunrise rates is \( \approx 2 \); according to Yagova et al. (1999), who examined a 5 days period characterized by a rather high ULF wave activity, the ratio of the after-sunrise intensity to the pre-sunrise intensity would be \( \approx 1.6 \) at \( L \approx 1.6 \); Tanaka et al. (2007) found that the amplitude of Pc3 fluctuations detected between \( L \approx 1.0–2.1 \) is \( \approx 2–4 \) times greater after dawn than before dawn and is greater at higher latitudes. Fig. 1c compares, for the H-component, the LT variation of the occurrence rates in the upstream \( (R_{HU}, \text{ blue trace}) \) and in the resonance band \( (R_{HR}, \text{ red trace}) \). It clearly shows that, while the higher frequency activity is confined within the daytime sector, before \( \approx 06 \text{ LT} \) the wave activity is due only to the lower frequency events: their morphology, waveforms and duration reveal that they mostly consist of penetrating upstream waves, with an additional
contribution of Pi2 waves, more relevant around midnight (Villante and Tiberi, 2016). In general, in the scientific literature, the occurrence of ULF waves in the dark hemisphere has been mostly attributed to waves locally excited in association with substorms; nevertheless, in agreement with the present results, several papers presented evidence for upstream waves in the night sector: namely, Takahashi et al. (2005) discussed a nighttime Pc4 event ($f \approx 5$–20 mHz) originating upstream of the bow shock and detected at low latitudes ($L < 2$); Ponomarenko et al. (2010) reported magnetometer and radar observations in support of the propagation of upstream waves to the nightside; Takahashi et al. (2016) presented evidence for ULF waves of upstream origin propagating to the midnight sector of the inner magnetosphere; lastly, Yagova et al. (2017), from one year of Pc3 observations between $L \approx 1.45$–1.83, found two groups of nighttime Pc3 fluctuations: the counterpart of morning Pc3 and the locally generated Pc3, probably associated with non-substorm bursty processes.

4. The long term variation and the role of the SW speed

Fig. 2 shows the 13-months running averages of several parameters (evaluated when at least 75% of the expected data are available): the sunspots number ($S_{13}$); the solar wind speed ($V_{SW_{13}}$); the interplanetary magnetic field strength ($B_{IMF_{13}}$); the total occurrence rate of events ($R_{TOT_{13}}$); the relative occurrence ($R_{HD_{13}}$); in addition, it shows the 13-months medians of the daytime values of the foF2 and foE parameters. As evidenced by the $S$ behavior, the solar cycle 23 is more
active than the solar cycle 24; the SW speed is high during ≃2003 (with peak values such as <V_{SW}>_13 ≃ 550 km/s, centered on August) and low during ≃1997 (<V_{SW}>_13 ≃ 375 km/s; September) and during ≃2009 (<V_{SW}>_13 ≃ 360 km/s; August); the average IMF during ≃1999–2003 ranged between ≃6.5–7.5 nT (with highest values between ≃Sept. 2002–March 2003) while attained minimum values of ≃4–4.5 nT during ≃2007–2009 (with lowest intensities between ≃October 2008–May 2009): according to the well-known relationship between the frequency of the upstream waves, f_u and B_{sw} (f_u (mHz) ≃ k*B_{min} (nT); k ≃ 6; according to Troitskaya et al., 1971; Troitskaya, 1994) and consistent with Fig. 1a, the upstream waves, over the entire period, would be mostly expected between f = 28–42 mHz. The trends of <f0F2>_13 and <f0E>_13 basically reflect the long term modulation of the sunspot number (Davies, 1990; Hargreaves, 1995). The occurrence rate of events, <R_T>_13, is, in general, much higher during solar cycle 23 than during the deep solar minimum and the rising phase of solar cycle 24. Clearly influenced by V_{SW} (Yedidia et al., 1991; Villante and Tiberi, 2015), <R_T>_13 attains highest values during ≃2002-2003. The <R_{H>_13} behavior shows that the selected H events (more energetic) are relatively more frequent during higher solar activity conditions while, during the deep minimum, the D events are, on average, almost twice as frequent as the H events.

Separate analysis of the wave characteristics for periods of high and slow V_{SW} confirm (Yedidia et al., 1991) that during high V_{SW} (Fig. 3a, 2002–2003), when the upstream waves reveal, in the D component, higher percentages at f ≃ 34–46 mHz (consistently, the average IMF, in the period of interest, would suggest a favorite range f_u ≃ 38–46 mHz), the FLRs are strongly favored and reveal higher percentages between f ≃ 58–66 mHz; almost as frequent as the upstream waves in the H distribution, the FLRs manifest, at some extent, also in the D distribution. By contrast, during low V_{SW} (Figs. 3b and 2008–2010), the frequency distributions of the D and H events (very similar) reveal more pronounced percentages at f ≃ 30–42 mHz (f_u ≃ 26–34 mHz for k ≃ 6; in this time interval the results are better consistent with the value k ≃ 7 proposed by Ponomarenko et al., 2002). In this case the FLRs are extremely rare, an aspect consistent with the results obtained by Vellante et al. (2007) who concluded that, at our latitude, the FLRs are rare during quiet magnetospheric conditions (<10% for Kp < 1). Interestingly, in this case, due to the extremely low rates of H events, some signatures of FLRs are better identified, above f = 70 mHz, in the D component.

5. The seasonal dependence

In order to examine the seasonal dependence of the ULF occurrence and characteristics we compared in Fig. 4 the results obtained during the winter solstice season (November, December, January, for the entire period 1996–2015) with those obtained during the summer solstice season (May, June, July, for the entire period 1996–2015; different choices of the time intervals do not affect significantly our results).

As usually observed, in winter, the daytime level of f0E is lower (on average, ≃2.7 MHz; Fig. 4a) and less extended in time (≃06–18 LT) than in summer (≃3.3 MHz; ≃04–21 LT; Fig. 4b); on the contrary, consistent with the so called “winter anomaly” (i.e., the daytime electron densities in the F2 layer are larger in winter than in summer; Rishbeth and Garriott, 1969; Rishbeth et al., 2000; Ezquer et al., 2014; Perna et al., 2017), the daytime average level of f0F2 in winter (≃7.5 MHz) is higher than in summer (≃6.9 MHz; see Pietrella et al., 2012, for a long term analysis of the f0F2 variability over Rome). Remarkably, the results obtained for the event occurrence reveal that, practically for the same average SW speed (<V_{SW}>_w ≃ 480 km/s; <V_{SW}>_s ≃ 486 km/s; subscripts “w” and “s”...
The comparison of the LT dependencies shows several interesting aspects. Indeed, in winter, both foF2 and R\textsubscript{T} sharply increase after ≈07 LT, while in summer, smoother increases of these parameters occur after ≈06 LT. In winter, R\textsubscript{T} shows two prominent peaks of comparable height at ≈08–09 LT (morning peak) and at ≈12–13 LT (noon peak); in summer, a broad and less pronounced R\textsubscript{T} enhancement occurs between ≈08 and 12 LT (peaked at ≈09–10 LT). In the afternoon, the wave activity rapidly decreases in both seasons while the foF2 level persists high in summer. In the pre-morning sector, R\textsubscript{T} shows, in winter, a peak at ≈04–05 LT and a minimum at ≈06–07 LT; in summer, the R\textsubscript{T} profile is more pronounced, with a prominent peak at ≈03–04 LT, followed by a minimum, approximately 2 h later (≈05–06 LT); interestingly, in both seasons, the R\textsubscript{T} and foF2 minima are almost simultaneous. In practise, in the pre-morning sector, the winter pattern appears to be delayed ≈1 h compared to the summer one: this feature determines the observed plateau of R\textsubscript{T} between ≈05 and 07 LT, when the wave occurrence is averaged over a whole year (Fig. 1b; interestingly, a similar plateau in the global wave activity appears between ≈06:30–07:30 LT in earliest analysis of the ULF occurrence at \(\lambda = 49^\circ\); see Fig. 5 of Saito, 1964). On the contrary (although rarely remarked), a drop in the wave intensity, preceding the morning increase, appears in several figures related to short term analysis (for example, Fig. 5 in Yagova et al., 1999). On average, the ratio between the morning and the pre-sunrise peak is ≈2.4 in winter and ≈1.5 in summer.

The comparison of the frequency distributions (Fig. 5) shows, during the winter, a reduced FLRs occurrence and the wave activity, on both components (blue traces in both panels), is mostly due to the penetrating upstream waves; during the summer (red traces), the FLRs provide, at higher frequencies, a relevant contribution on the distribution of the H events (much poorer in the D distribution); remarkably, although less frequent, the winter FLRs, on average, show lower frequencies than the summer ones.

6. The solar cycle dependence

To analyse the aspects related to the solar cycle variation, we focused on the solar minima and maxima considering the following intervals: SOLMIN1: May 1996–July 1997; SOLMAX1: May 2000–January 2003; SOLMIN2: May 2007–January 2010; SOLMAX2: November 2012–July 2015 (see Fig. 2a); except for SOLMIN1 (including one winter solstice and two summer solstices), each interval includes three winter and three summer solstices. As recently detailed by Burns et al. (2014), who conducted a long term analysis (2000–2011) at stations located between \(\lambda \approx +/−50^\circ\), it is useful to remind that the winter anomaly is significant at solar maximum and virtually not existent at solar minimum. As we show in the following, in substantial agreement, in our case, during solar minima, the winter and the summer foF2 average levels are more or less comparable while during solar maxima the winter levels largely exceed the summer ones.

6.1. Solar minima

During SOLMIN1, the winter level of foF2 between 09 and 15 LT (≈6.0 MHz; Fig. 6a) exceeds by ≈10% the summer one (≈5.4 MHz; Fig. 6b); in this case, for slightly greater SW speeds, the winter rate of events (\(\sim <R_{\text{T}}>w \approx 11.0\)) far exceeds the summer one (\(\sim <R_{\text{T}}>s \approx 2.1\)), with an average ratio such as ≈5.2. During the winter, moreover, a peak
emerges at $\approx03–04$ LT, the early morning variation is steep, the dayside activity is intense (with three peaks at $\approx09$ LT, $\approx11$ LT, $\approx13$ LT); in addition, some evidence for a $R_T$ enhancement occurs near the dusk terminator ($\approx16–18$ LT), when $foF2$ rapidly decreases. During the summer (Fig. 6b), small $R_T$ enhancements occur at $\approx03–04$ LT and at $\approx06–07$ LT and the daytime wave activity is depressed. A similar situation occurs during SOLMIN2; in this case, the winter (Fig. 6c) and the summer level of $foF2$ (Fig. 6d) are practically the same in the dayside ($\approx5.3$ MHz) and, despite a SW speed somewhat lower than in summer, the ratio between the winter and the summer event occurrence is $\approx1.4$ for the entire day and $\approx2.2$ between 09 and 15 LT. During the winter, a prominent peak occurs at $\approx04–05$ LT and the associated minimum is simultaneous to the $foF2$ one ($\approx06–07$ LT); as for the previous case, in addition to the morning and noon peak, an $R_T$ enhancement occurs near the dusk terminator (accompanied by a $foF2$ decrease). Noticeably, during the summer, the $R_T$ peak at $\approx03–04$ LT sharply exceeds the daytime rates. The results in Fig. 7 show that, during both minima, the highest percentages of upstream waves occurred between $f = 30–38$ mHz (i.e., practically the same range found by Vellante et al., 1996; $f = 30–40$ mHz during 1985). On the other hand, contrary to Vellante et al. (1996), who found FLRs above $f = 80–85$ mHz during solar minima, the summer distributions of H events do not show any clear evidence for relevant FLRs contributions; likely, this aspect might be related to the poor occurrence of H events ($<R_T> \approx1\%$) due to the low SW speed characterizing SOLMIN1 ($<V_{SW}> \approx375$ km/s) and to the extremely quiet magnetospheric conditions and reduced EUV radiation characterizing SOLMIN2.

6.2. Solar maxima

During SOLMAX1, the SW speeds in winter (Fig. 8a) and in summer (Fig. 8b) are comparable while the daytime winter level of $foF2$ ($\approx10.4$ MHz) exceeds the summer level ($\approx8.2$ MHz); in this case, differently from solar minima, the global summer occurrence exceeds the winter one with a ratio $\approx1.3$, an aspect more pronounced in the morning sector. In both seasons the pre-dawn $R_T$ peaks are less explicit than in other cases; during the winter, $R_T$ confirms the morning and the noon peaks; during the summer, the broad $R_T$ enhancement occurs at $\approx10–12$ LT. During SOLMAX2 (much less active; Fig. 8c), the winter $foF2$ level ($\approx9.1$ MHz) exceeds the summer level in the dayside ($\approx7.7$ MHz); the summer occurrence rate (for comparable SW speeds) exceeds the winter one, on average by a factor $\approx2.2$. During the winter, the $R_T$ peaks occurring at $\approx04–05$ LT and at $\approx08–09$ LT are comparable. As for SOLMIN2, in this solar cycle, during the summer, a dominant peak emerges at $\approx03–04$ LT, well above the daytime level. The frequency distributions (Fig. 9) shows that, at both solar maxima, the upstream waves mostly ranges between $f = 34–46$ mHz, suggesting a solar cycle modulation of the frequency of the upstream waves smaller than that one found by Vellante et al. (1996; $f \approx50$ mHz during 1989–1991); note also that during periods of higher solar activity (SOLMAX1), the higher summer occurrence mostly comes from FLRs, far exceeding the upstream percentages in the H distribution (in this case a relevant percentage of FLRs is detected also in the D component). The higher resonance frequencies ($f \approx 66–86$ mHz; Fig. 9d) detected during SOLMAX2 with respect to those detected during SOLMAX1 ($f \approx 58–74$ mHz; Fig. 9c) are consistent with the results obtained by Vellante et al. (1996) who suggested that the resonant mode, in general, occurs at lower frequencies during higher solar activity conditions. The comparison

![Image of plots showing hourly rates of occurrence of events during summer and winter for SOLMAX1 and SOLMAX2.](image-url)
between seasons confirms a tendency of lower resonance frequencies to occur during the winter (Fig. 9c).

7. Summary and discussion

Following previous analysis (Villante and Tiberi, 2015, 2016), we examined the solar cycle and seasonal modulation of the occurrence and characteristics of the relevant wave events in the mid-frequency ULF range ($f \approx 20–100$ mHz) detected at a low latitude ground-based station (L’Aquila, Italy) between $\approx 1996–2015$. For this scope, we examined $\approx 51,000$ events on each component, H and D, with several interesting results.

a) For comparable SW speeds, during the winter the dayside wave activity appears more intense than during the summer; in addition, the winter activity mostly consists of upstream waves, with some predominance of D events (Figs. 4 and 5). This suggests a seasonal dependence of the attenuation and rotation of the downgoing signal through the ionosphere and, during winter, less efficient ionospheric conditions for the onset of relevant FLRs. These aspects might be related to the lower electron densities in the E layer during the winter; on the other hand, the higher variability of $f_{o}F_{2}$ observed in the winter months (Pietrella et al., 2012) might well contribute to the higher ULF activity in ground observations. The comparison with earliest investigations suggests controversial results: according to Saito (1964), indeed, at $L \approx 1.3$, the wave activity, in general, might be somewhat more intense in summer than in winter; on the other hand, in agreement with the present results, it attained minimum values in the summer during solar minimum. Our results reveal also a tendency of lower resonance frequencies to occur during the winter: this aspect is consistent with the annual modulation of the plasma-spheric density (determining the resonance frequency) which attains maximum values in December and minimum values in July (Vellante et al., 2007).

b) Lanzerotti et al. (1981) and Howard and Menk (2005) considered the much higher morning activity consistent with a source region close to the subsolar magnetopause; indeed, when the IMF orientation is along the nominal spiral, most of the propagating upstream waves are expected to be blown back toward the morning side of the magnetosphere where the quasi-parallel bow shock structure would also provide favourable conditions for the local generation of upstream waves. Our results suggest that these aspects more clearly occur during the winter, when the FLR contribution is poor: in this season, indeed, the event occurrence peaks at $\approx 08–09$ LT and at $\approx 12–13$ LT, suggesting a relevant penetration of the upstream waves through the morning flank of the magnetopause, together with waves penetrating through the nose region. On the other hand, an additional source for the wave activity around noon during the winter might come from the variability of the electron density in the F2-layer: indeed, as shown by Pietrella et al. (2012), a midday maximum of the $f_{o}F_{2}$ variability emerges in winter while it is poorly distinguishable in summer. During the summer the concurring contribution of the upstream and the resonant waves would rather determine a broad (and smoother) enhancement of the occurrence rate in a wide sector between $\approx 09$ and 12 LT.

c) Rapidly increasing after midnight, during the summer, $R_T$ shows a peak at $\approx 03–04$ LT (remarkably, in summer, this peak might exceed the dayside level) and a minimum at $\approx 05–06$ LT; during the winter, a similar, less pronounced profile is delayed about $\approx 1$ h. The entire pattern appears related to ionospheric features: indeed, in both

![Fig. 9.](image-url)
d) The analysis conducted for different phases of the solar cycle reveals that, during solar minima, the winter rate of the event occurrence (even in absence of an explicit winter anomaly) persists higher than during the summer; by contrast, differently from the average behavior, during solar maxima the summer wave activity exceeds the winter one: this feature might be mostly related to the more frequent impact on the magnetosphere of energetic SW structures during solar maxima; in summer, given the favourable ionospheric conditions, they might determine a much more frequent manifestation of relevant resonance events. The higher daytime wave activity detected in summer during solar maxima might be related also to the ionospheric variability; indeed, Pietrella et al. (2012) found that, for low solar activity, the daytime $f_{o}F2$ variability is, on average, enhanced in winter, while, for high solar activity, it is enhanced in summer. In the past, Verò (1981) and Verò and Menk (1986), comparing winter and summer observations at northern mid-latitudes during solar maximum years, suggested a “winter damping” in the ULF activity in association with a local $f_{o}F2$ increase above $\sim 10^{-11}$ MHz. Interestingly, in substantial agreement with the present conclusions, Verò et al. (1995) re-examined data from stations (including AQU) located below $L \approx 3$ and concluded that the smaller winter activity was mostly related to the smaller occurrence of fluctuations above $f \approx 50$ mHz (i.e. mostly in the range of FLRs).
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