Can an impulsive variation of the solar wind plasma pressure trigger a plasma bubble? A case study based on CSES, Swarm and THEMIS data
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Abstract

During the August 25, 2018 geomagnetic storm, the new borne CSES-01 satellite and the Swarm A satellite detected a really large equatorial plasma bubble (EPB) in the post-midnight sector over western Africa. We investigated the features of this deep ionospheric plasma depletion using data from the Langmuir probes on-board CSES-01 and Swarm A satellites, and data from the high-precision magnetometer and the electric field detector instruments on-board CSES-01. Using also plasma and magnetic field data from THEMIS-E satellite we found that, during the passage of the magnetic cloud that drove the geomagnetic storm, an impulsive variation lasting about ten minutes characterized the solar wind (SW) pressure. The analysis of the delay time, between the occurrence of such impulsive variation and the detection of the plasma bubble, suggests a possible link between the SW pressure impulsive variation as identified by THEMIS-E and the generation of the EPB as detected by CSES-01 and Swarm A. We put forward the hypothesis that the SW pressure impulsive variation might have triggered an eastward prompt penetrating electric field that propagated from high to equatorial latitudes, overlapping in the nightside region to the zonal westward electric field, causing either a reduction or an inversion, at the base of the EPB triggering.
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1. Introduction

Plasma density depletions, which are observed in the equatorial ionosphere at different spatial (~50–1000 km) and temporal scales, are called equatorial plasma bubbles (EPBs). Typically, EPBs are detected within a narrow band...
of ±20° dip latitude, at altitudes between the bottomside of the ionospheric F region and up to ~1000 km of altitude (Woodman and Hoz, 1976; Ossakow and Chaturvedi, 1978). Tsunoda (1980) and Tsunoda et al. (1982) showed that EPBs appear primarily at local dusk and, during their ascending motion in the ionosphere, present a stretched, wedge-like structure in the north–south direction along the geomagnetic field lines. As a matter of fact, after local sunset, at low latitudes the so-called pre-reversal enhancement of the geomagnetic field lines. As a matter of fact, after local sunset, at low latitudes the so-called pre-reversal enhancement of the geomagnetic field lines.

When a geomagnetic storm occurs, electric field perturbations can be generated by prompt penetration electric fields (PPEFs) of magnetospheric origin and/or by the so-called ionospheric disturbance dynamo (e.g., Blanc and Richmond, 1980; Fejer and Scherliess, 1995; Fejer et al., 2008; Huang et al., 2007a, 2007b; Piersanti et al., 2017). On the dusk sector, PPEFs can superimpose on the background low-latitude zonal electric field that is present also under quiet conditions. This process can either suppress or favor the EPB development, the latter case being usually accompanied by a significant uplift of the ionospheric plasma (e.g., Ossakow and Chaturvedi, 1978; Aarons, 1991; Abdu et al., 1995; Fejer et al., 1999; Basu et al., 2001, 2007). Recently, significant plasma bubbles have been observed also at mid latitudes. Specifically, Ma and Maruyama (2006) observed, for the first time, a super-bubble at mid latitudes over Japan during the moderate February 12, 2000 geomagnetic storm; Huang et al. (2007a) using data from the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites for the 2003 Halloween super-storm; Huang et al. (2007a) using data from the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites for the 2003 Halloween super-storm; Huang et al. (2007a) using data from the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites for the 2003 Halloween super-storm. On the dusk sector, PPEFs can superimpose on the background low-latitude zonal electric field that is present also under quiet conditions. This process can either suppress or favor the EPB development, the latter case being usually accompanied by a significant uplift of the ionospheric plasma (e.g., Ossakow and Chaturvedi, 1978; Aarons, 1991; Abdu et al., 1995; Fejer et al., 1999; Basu et al., 2001, 2007). Recently, significant plasma bubbles have been observed also at mid latitudes. Specifically, Ma and Maruyama (2006) observed, for the first time, a super-bubble at mid latitudes over Japan during the moderate February 12, 2000 geomagnetic storm; Huang et al. (2007a) using data from the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites for the 2003 Halloween super-storm; Huang et al. (2007a) using data from the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites for the 2003 Halloween super-storm.

A better understanding of the generation mechanisms and dynamics of EPBs has become a priority for the space weather community, because they can severely affect trans-ionospheric radio waves and hence communication and navigation systems. Although EPBs have been extensively studied for several decades (Tsunoda, 1980, 2005; Zalesak and Ossakow, 1980; Farley et al., 1986; Fejer et al., 1999; Keskinen et al., 2003; Bhattacharyya, 2004; Otsuka et al., 2004; Bumrungkit et al., 2018; Joshi et al., 2019; Marew et al., 2019; Yokoyama, 2017; Wan et al., 2019), there are still some outstanding questions that need to be clarified to improve our current understanding of their seeding mechanisms. More specifically, an important issue to clarify is how magnetic storms affect the generation of EPBs.

In this paper, we present the analysis of a significant EPB detected by CSES-01 and Swarm satellite missions during the August 2018 geomagnetic storm. By using a multi-instrumental approach, we suggest that an impulsive variation of the solar wind (SW) pressure might be responsible for the formation of such irregularity. Section 2 describes the data used in the analysis, Section 3 illustrates and discusses the results, while the conclusions are the subject of Section 4.

2. Data source

CSES-01 is the first satellite, in orbit since February 2018, of the multi-satellite China Seismo-Electromagnetic Satellite (CSES) mission (Shen et al., 2018). It is a sun-synchronous satellite flying at an altitude of ~507 km; its orbital descending node time is at around 14:00 local time (LT), while the ascending one is at around 2:00 LT, the revisiting period being of about 5 days. CSES-01 hosts nine payloads: a high-precision magnetometer (HPM; Zhou et al., 2018), a search coil magnetometer (Wang Q. et al., 2018), an electric field detector (EFD; Huang et al., 2018), a Langmuir probe (LAP; Yan et al., 2018), a plasma analyzer (Liu et al., 2019), a high energetic particle package (Li et al., 2019), a high-energy particle detector (Picozza et al., 2019), a Global Navigation Satellite System occultation receiver (Lin et al., 2018), and a tri-band beacon (Chen et al., 2018).

HPM comprises a dual fluxgate magnetometer which can record the magnetic vector and intensity in the frequency range from Direct Current (DC) to 15 Hz. EFD measures the potential of four probes (floating potential, \( V_f \) hereafter), installed at the tips of the four booms, and derives the electric field as the difference among \( V_f \) in the frequency range between DC and 3.5 MHz (Huang et al., 2018). LAP is designed to measure in-situ plasma density and electron temperature every 3 s in survey mode and every 1.5 s in burst mode. In this study we used 1 s resolution geomagnetic field (from HPM), 1 s resolution electric field (from EFD) and 3 s resolution electron density (from LAP) data. To obtain reliable electric field observations, we removed from EFD data the \( \mathbf{v}_e \times \mathbf{B} \) contribution due to satellite’s motion, being \( \mathbf{v}_e \) the velocity of the satellite and \( \mathbf{B} \) the observed geomagnetic field. Both EFD and HPM data are given in a geographical coordinate frame.

Swarm is a constellation of three Low Earth Orbit satellites (named A, B, and C) launched at the end of 2013 by the European Space Agency (ESA) (Friis-Christensen et al., 2006, 2008). Swarm satellites are orbiting the Earth in a circular near-polar orbit; A and C fly side-by-side at the same altitude that was of about 440 km on August 2018 (with an inclination of 87.35°, an east–west separation of 1–1.5° in longitude, and a maximal differential delay in orbit of approximately 10 s), while B flies at an altitude that was of about 510 km in the same period (with an inclination of 87.75°) in an orbital plane which has gradually got farther away from those of the other two satellites during the mission’s lifetime (9 LT hours after 4 years). All Swarm satellites are equipped with identical
Instruments consisting of Global Positioning System receivers and sensors for measuring both magnetic and electric fields, and plasma density. In this work we used Level 1b electron density measurements with a resolution of 1 s (https://earth.esa.int/documents/10174/1514862/Swarm_L1b_Product_Definition) made by the Langmuir probe (LP) (Knudsen et al., 2017; Lomidze et al., 2018).

For solar wind parameters analysis, we used THEMIS-E satellite data, namely the moments of the ion distribution functions obtained from the on-board moments calculations of the electrostatic analyzer (McFadden et al., 2008), which operates in the range from 25 eV to 25 keV, and the magnetic field measurements of the fluxgate magnetometer (Auster et al., 2008) in the geocentric solar ecliptic system.

3. Results and discussion

On August 25, 2018 an interplanetary coronal mass ejection (ICME) arrived at the Earth at 13:55 universal time (UT), generating a G3-class geomagnetic storm. As shown by Piersanti et al. (2020), on August 26, 2018 at 7:11 UT, and as visible in Fig. 1, the SYM-H index fell down to \(-206\) nT. Indeed, the north–south component \(B_z\) of the interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) recorded onboard ACE satellite at around 16:00 UT on August 25 switched southward for around eighteen hours, reaching a maximum negative value of \(-20\) nT; then it turned northward for a very long recovery phase of about 5 days. Simultaneously, again starting at around 16:00 UT of August 25, solar wind pressure experiences a constant increase lasting about fourteen hours, while solar wind speed seems to maintain quite a stable value around 400 km/s.

Generally, when a sudden intensification of the westward ring current occurs, PPEFs from high latitudes trigger low-latitude ionospheric irregularities (Basu et al., 2001, 2005). Specifically, in the post-sunset zone, an eastward PPEF superimposes on the local eastward electric field due to the ionospheric dynamo, causing a fast uplift of the ionospheric plasma that may generate EPBs (Basu et al., 2007; Cherniak and Zakharenkova, 2016).

On August 26, 2018 between \(-01:27\) UT and \(-01:31\) UT, during the main phase of the geomagnetic storm, CSES-01 observed a significant EPB over the equatorial western African region (Fig. 2a, cyan part of the black orbit); specifically, the electron density measured by CSES-01 fell down from \(-5\cdot10^10\) m\(^{-3}\) to \(-4\cdot10^7\) m\(^{-3}\) (Fig. 2b, black curve). The same bubble is recorded by Swarm A between \(-01:55\) UT and \(-02:05\) UT (Fig. 2a, cyan part of the red orbit; Fig. 2b, red curve). It is worth mentioning that CSES-01 electron density \((N_e)\) data were calibrated \((N_{e,\text{cal}})\) according to the following relation:

\[
N_{e,\text{cal}} = N_e \cdot 1.35 \cdot 1.5,
\]

where the multiplication factors 1.35 and 1.5 take into account, respectively, the Wipple effect (Whipple, 1990) and the different altitude between CSES-01 and Swarm A orbits. Fig. 2 shows that, even though the Swarm A LP saturates for electron density values by far higher than those saturating the CSES-01 LAP, the EPB latitudinal extension \((15–20^\circ)\) is well defined by both satellites. The slight difference between the EPB latitudinal extension recorded by

![Fig. 1. ACE satellite solar wind parameters and IMF, and SYM-H index. From top to bottom: solar wind speed (a) and pressure (b), IMF \(B_z\) component (c), SYM-H index (d). The horizontal dotted black lines in panels c and d represent a zero line. The vertical dashed grey line indicates the 16:00 UT of August 25.](#)
CSES-01 and Swarm has to be simply ascribed to the evolution characterizing the bubble in the time interval differentiating the two orbits. At the same time, taking into account that the Swarm A orbit is about 30 min later than the CSES-01 one, we can claim that this structure is rather stable both in space and time.

This passage through the EPB is confirmed by the EFD observations as shown by Fig. 3, where the four measured probe potentials \((V_A, V_B, V_C, V_D)\) and the components \((E_X, E_Y, E_Z)\) of the electric field \(E\) are illustrated.

For each probe, \(V_f\) adjusts so that the sum of all the entering electric currents is equal to zero, i.e.:

\[
\sum_i I_i = 0,
\]

where \(I_i\) are the ion and electron currents collected by the plasma, the photoelectron emission and the bias current injected by the EFD electronics. Since the bias current is fixed at 500 nA and the photoelectron current is negligible, \(V_f\) can be considered linearly dependent on the plasma density variations (Diego et al., 2017). Concerning the really smoothed low values by CSES-01 in Fig. 2, the lowest value of electron density leading EFD to saturation can be estimated from the plasma current equation relative to the electron density (Boyd, 1968; Diego et al., 2017, and references therein), i.e.:

\[
I_e = \frac{1}{4} q N_e \sqrt{\frac{8 k_B T_e S_e}{\pi m_e}} \left(1 + \frac{q \Delta V}{k_B T_e}\right),
\]

where \(k_B\) is the Boltzmann constant, \(T_e\) is the electron temperature, \(m_e\) is the electron mass, \(S_e\) is the probe surface, \(q\) is the electric charge, \(\Delta V\) is the difference between the local plasma potential and the probe potential, and \(N_e\) is the electron density. From Eq. (3) it can be computed that

![Figure 2. Plasma bubble detection by CSES-01 and Swarm A satellites. (Panel a) CSES-01 orbit (black), between 01:15 UT and 01:45 UT, and Swarm A orbit (red), between 01:38 UT and 02:08 UT, on August 26, 2018; the cyan parts of both orbits highlight the time interval when the EPB was detected by each satellite. (Panel b) electron density as measured by (black) CSES-01 and (red) Swarm A. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)](image-url)
saturation occurs only when $N_e < 7 \times 10^7 \text{ m}^{-3}$ (considering an average electron temperature of 2300 K). This highlights the higher capability of CSES-01 LAP to record this kind of deep electron density depletions with respect to Swarm LP.

In Fig. 3, the plateaus centered at around 01:29 UT are the clear signature of the EFD saturation that occurs when the satellite is inside the EPB. This is due to the EFD electronic design that allows a maximum $V_f$ value of about 9.6 V. If the plasma density decreases, $V_f$ moves naturally toward positive values to collect more electrons, thus satisfying Eq. (2). Each time that very low values of electron densities are experienced, the injected bias becomes dominant and $V_f$ easily increases up to the saturation level.

Fig. 3 shows also significant fluctuations at both edges of the EPB. These have been interpreted by Pottelette et al. (2007) in terms of Kinetic Alfvén waves.

The same fluctuations, observed when the satellite enters and exits from the EPB, are also shown in Fig. 4 where the values of $v_z$ component of plasma drift velocity $v$, evaluated as $v = (E \times B / B^2)$ using both HPM and EFD data recorded by CSES-01, are plotted.

As highlighted before, during quiet conditions, EPBs are usually generated in the post-sunset sector due to the Rayleigh-Taylor instability linked to the ionospheric dynamo dynamics characterizing low latitudes, after which they drift eastward (e.g. Whalen, 2000). So, in the first instance one may think that the depletion shown in Fig. 2 is a “fossil” EPB, that is an EPB generated far away from the site, specifically in the post-sunset sector, which zonally drifted eastward (Saito and Maruyama, 2006; Sekar et al., 2007). At the same time, it is also true that, especially during disturbed conditions, EPBs can be generated also in LT sectors different from the post-sunset one.
as shown by Wan et al. (2019) who performed a statistical study of equatorial plasma depletions occurrence considering a large dataset of 181 geomagnetic storms.

In order to investigate a possible connection between the solar wind dynamics and the appearance of the EPB shown in Fig. 2, we collected data from THEMIS-E that, in the period under investigation, was located in the interplanetary space, very close to the Earth’s magnetosphere (red circle in Fig. 5). Specifically, we analyzed observations between 00:15 UT and 02:45 UT on August 26, 2018 (Fig. 5) of IMF magnitude (panel a), plasma density \( \rho \) (panel b) and dynamic pressure \( P \) (panel c), using data from the spacecraft-collected fluxgate magnetometer and from the on board electron/ion moments instrument.

Fig. 5 shows that between 00:15 UT and 01:05 UT THEMIS-E was in the interplanetary space, since it was measuring values of plasma density and magnetic field that are consistent with the SW observations at L1 point during the passage of the ICME (Piersanti et al., 2020). This is confirmed in Fig. 5d which shows THEMIS-E position at 01:00 UT with respect to the magnetopause as modeled by Shue et al. (1998) and to the bow shock as modeled by Farris and Russell (1994). Fig. 5d clearly shows that, at this time, the satellite was well outside the Earth’s bow shock. It is only at about 02:00 UT that THEMIS-E came back inside the magnetosheath, as confirmed by the clear upstream wave activity before and after the sudden change of both plasma and magnetic field parameters (Bavassano et al., 1971; Lepidi et al., 1996; Turc et al., 2014).

However, between 01:06 UT and 01:11 UT, THEMIS-E detected a sudden change in both the magnetic field and plasma parameters (Fig. 5a–c). This indicates the crossing of the bow shock and the entrance in the magnetosheath, as confirmed by the clear activity before and after the sudden change of both plasma and magnetic field parameters (Bavassano et al., 1971; Lepidi et al., 1996; Turc et al., 2014).

By comparing the time at which the EPB is recorded by CSES-01 (Fig. 2b) to that of the SW structure detected by THEMIS-E, we find a delay time of \( T_E = 21 \pm 1 \) min, which is consistent with the transmission time of the interplanetary electric field to the equatorial ionosphere (Kelley et al., 1979; Huang et al., 2005; Wolf et al., 2007). Indeed, Bhaskar and Vichare (2013) showed that the delay time \( T_D \) between satellite observations in the interplanetary space and ground-based measurements can be expressed as:

\[
T_D = T_A + T_{BM} + T_{Alf} + T_T + T_R + T_{Trans},
\]

where \( T_A \) is the advection time of the SW to travel from the satellite to the Earth’s bow shock, \( T_{BM} \) is the propagation time from the bow shock to the magnetopause, \( T_{Alf} \) is the travel time along the magnetic field lines from the magnetopause to the polar ionosphere, \( T_T \) is the time needed by the interplanetary electric field to cross the magnetosphere, \( T_R \) is the reconfiguration time of the magnetosphere-ionosphere system, and \( T_{Trans} \) is the propagation time from the high latitudes to the equatorial ionosphere.

If we apply Eq. (4) to THEMIS-E data, following the results obtained by Khan and Cowley (1999) for the east–west ionospheric flow on the nightside, and neglecting \( T_A \) (because of the THEMIS-E proximity to the Earth’s bow shock), we obtain: \( T_{BM} = 0.9 \pm 0.5 \) min; \( T_{Alf} = 2.6 \pm 0.8 \) min; \( T_T = 1.6 \pm 0.5 \) min; \( T_R = 12.7 \pm 2.2 \) min; \( T_{Trans} = 2.4 \pm 0.8 \) min. The obtained values are in agreement with the observations of Manoj et al. (2008). As a
consequence, we found \( T_D = 20.2 \pm 2.0 \text{ min} \), which is consistent with the observed \( T_E \). This result suggests a possible link between the SW dynamic pressure impulsive variation identified by THEMIS-E and the generation of the EPB detected by CSES-01 and Swarm A. Specifically, such an impulsive variation of the SW parameters may have played a key role in generating this large EPB. In fact, the similarity between \( T_D \) and \( T_E \) leads us to think that the EPB detected by CSES-01 is not a “fossil” bubble generated in the post-sunset sector and then moved to the East, but rather a real “fresh” bubble generated right in that post-midnight sector. In support of this, the structure appears to be rather stable as Swarm A detected it in practically the same position about half an hour later, while considering a zonally drift velocity between 100 m/s and 200 m/s (Ji et al., 2015) it should have moved of about 200–400 km. Moreover, this fact is also supported by the following considerations: (1) well-developed plasma bubbles occur in the local midnight-dawn sector at low solar activity (in August 2018 the solar index \( R_{12} \) was equal to 6.7) (Huang et al., 2012), also during disturbed conditions (Wan et al., 2019); (2) several statistical studies (Stolle et al., 2006; Huang et al., 2014; Okoh et al., 2017) have shown that, in the African sector under investigation, the highest EPB occurrence is recorded during equinoxes, in a time window including the local time sector here investigated.

The idea is that this impulsive variation of the SW pressure triggered an eastward PPEF that propagated from high to equatorial latitudes. In the nightside region, this PPEF overlapped the local westward electric field (Balan and Bailey, 1995; Astafyeva et al., 2016), causing either a reduction or an inversion. In both cases the vertical ionospheric plasma drift was suddenly directed from downward to upward (Nicolls et al., 2006), which triggered most likely the observed EPB (Basu et al., 2007; Cherniak and Zakharenkova, 2016; Abdu, 2019).

On the other hand, an additional contribution to this uplift could be due also to the modification of the ionospheric dynamo. In fact, during quiet conditions, at night the ionospheric dynamo is such that the ionospheric plasma would move downward. However, during disturbed conditions, a geomagnetic storm induced energy input to the thermosphere may alter the global thermospheric circulation, with a consequent disturbance of the ionospheric dynamo which is at the base of a plasma uplift (Nicolls et al., 2006; Fejer et al., 2008). Indeed, Fejer et al. (2008) showed that, between approximately 00 LT and 06 LT
(i.e. a time window including the one here investigated), disturbance dynamo drifts are always upwards for disturbed conditions.

4. Conclusions

In this paper, data from CSES-01, Swarm A, and THEMIS-E are analyzed to investigate the possible origin of a significant post-midnight EPB occurred on August 26, 2018 over western Africa, during the main phase of a geomagnetic storm. Specifically, the analysis supports the hypothesis of a direct link between an impulsive variation of the SW dynamic pressure, observed by THEMIS-E, and the deep EPB observed by CSES-01 and Swarm A. Indeed, the delay time between the impulsive variation of the SW parameters and the detection of the ionospheric EPB very well matches with the theoretical delay time between satellite observations in the interplanetary space and ground-based measurements. A possible mechanism able to explain this link, and hence at the origin of the observed EPB, can be summarized in the following chain of events, temporally ordered from the first to the last:

1. impulsive variation of the SW pressure during the passage of the magnetic cloud;
2. generation of an eastward prompt penetrating electric field which propagates to the nightside equatorial ionosphere;
3. intensification of an upward disturbance dynamo drift;
4. occurrence of either a sudden decrease of the nightside westward equatorial electrojet or a reversal of it;
5. significant uplift of the ionospheric plasma which is at the base of the detected EPB, which is really a “fresh” EPB generated in the post-midnight sector.
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