1 2 3 4 5	THEMIS observations of a Hot Flow Anomaly at the Earth's bow shock: simultaneous solar wind, magnetosheath and ground based measurements	
6	J. P. Eastwood <sup>(1)</sup> , D. G. Sibeck <sup>(2)</sup> , V. Angelopoulos <sup>(3,1)</sup> , TD. Phan <sup>(1)</sup> , S. D. Bale <sup>(1,4)</sup> , J. P	
7	McFadden <sup>(1)</sup> , C. M. Cully <sup>(5,6)</sup> , H. Frey <sup>(1)</sup> , S. B. Mende <sup>(1)</sup> , D. Larson <sup>(1)</sup>	
8		
9	1. Space Sciences Laboratory, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley CA	
10	USA	
11	2. NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt MD USA	
12	3. Dept. of Earth and Space Sciences, IGPP, UCLA, Los Angeles CA USA	
13	4. Dept. of Physics, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley CA USA	
14	5. LASP, University of Colorado, Boulder CO USA	
15	6. Now at Swedish Institute of Space Physics, Uppsala, Sweden	
16		
17	Index Terms	
18	7851 Shock waves	
19	2784 Solar wind/ magnetosphere interactions	
20	7811 Discontinuities	

21 2740 Magnetospheric configuration and dynamics

# 1 2 Abstract

3	The THEMIS spacecraft encountered a Hot Flow Anomaly (HFA) on the dusk flank of
4	the Earth's bow shock on 4 July 2007, observing it on both sides of the shock
5	simultaneously. Meanwhile, the THEMIS ground magnetometers traced the progress of
6	the associated Magnetic Impulse Event (MIE) along the dawn flank of the
7	magnetosphere, providing a unique opportunity to study the transmission of the HFA
8	through the shock and the subsequent downstream response. THEMIS-A, in the solar
9	wind, observed classic HFA signatures. Isotropic electron distributions inside the
10	upstream HFA are attributed to the action of the electron firehose instability. THEMIS-E,
11	just downstream, observed a much more complex disturbance with the pressure
12	perturbation decoupled from the underlying discontinuity. Simple calculations show that
13	the pressure perturbation would be capable of significantly changing the magnetopause
14	location, which is confirmed by the ground based observations.

#### 1 1. Introduction

2 Hot Flow Anomalies (HFAs) are disruptions of the solar wind flow, lasting a few 3 minutes, observed in the vicinity of the terrestrial bow shock [e.g. review by Schwartz et 4 al., 2000 and references therein]. They are caused by Tangential Discontinuities (TDs) 5 interacting with the bow shock [Schwartz, 1995]. If the solar wind convection electric 6 field points into the TD, ions specularly reflected at the shock are channeled back along 7 the current sheet [Burgess, 1989; Thomas et al., 1991]. This results in a hot ion population 8 which expands, excavating the solar wind and laterally driving pile up regions and shock 9 waves [Fuselier et al., 1987;Lucek et al., 2004]. Whilst the evolution of ion distributions 10 from multi-component to a single hot component is relatively well understood, the way in 11 which the electrons become isotropic and thermalized has not been established [Schwartz, 12 1995].

13

14 HFAs can generate considerable dynamic pressure fluctuations in the upstream solar 15 wind, and it has been suggested that they have a significant impact on the magnetosphere 16 [Sibeck et al., 1998,1999; Sitar et al., 1998]. However, theoretical studies indicate that 17 solar wind structure is significantly modified by its passage through the bow shock [Völk 18 and Auer, 1974; Wu et al., 1993], and it is unclear that the coherent upstream dynamic 19 pressure variation generated by the HFA survives through the shock. To address this 20 problem, it is necessary to study HFAs both upstream and in the magnetosheath with 21 simultaneous observations.

1	Although HFA signatures have been observed on both sides of the bow shock, most
2	observations have been made with single spacecraft in the solar wind [Schwartz et al.,
3	2000]. HFAs have been observed by Cluster [Lucek et al., 2004] but all the spacecraft
4	were upstream of the bow shock. Another multipoint HFA study used Interball-1 and
5	Magion-4, but again both spacecraft were upstream [Koval et al., 2005]. Here THEMIS
6	[Angelopoulos et al., 2008] observations of an HFA are presented. The THEMIS
7	spacecraft observed an HFA on both sides of the bow shock simultaneously for the first
8	time, and the THEMIS ground based observatories observed the subsequent response of
9	the magnetosphere. This thus provided a new opportunity to understand how HFAs
10	evolve over their lifetime.
11	
12 13	2. In-situ observations
14	The HFA was observed on 4 July 2007, during the first phase of the mission when the
15	THEMIS spacecraft apogee was on the dayside and the probes were in close formation.
16	The THEMIS spacecraft were on the inbound leg of their orbit, in the vicinity of the post-
17	noon bow shock. As shown in Figure 1 (and Table 1), THEMIS-A and THEMIS-B were
18	separated by approximately 2 Earth radii $(R_E)$ along a common orbit, with the other three
19	spacecraft more closely spaced between them. A model shock surface [Farris et al.,
20	1991] is shown in red. The HFA was observed by THEMIS-A at 10:26:00UT in the solar
21	wind; at that time the other spacecraft were in the magnetosheath.
22	
23	2.1 THEMIS-A in the solar wind: upstream obsevations

1	Figure 2 shows THEMIS-A data from the magnetic field experiment (FGM) [Auster et
2	al., 2008], thermal plasma instrument (ESA) [McFadden et al., 2008] and search coil
3	magnetometer (SCM) [Roux et al., 2008]. At 10:24:50UT, THEMIS-A crossed the bow
4	shock (red dashed line) into the solar wind. Shortly afterwards, THEMIS-A encountered
5	the HFA: a significant deflection in the plasma velocity, together with reduced magnetic
6	field strength, reduced density and plasma heating was observed around 10:26:00UT.
7	Surrounding this region, the plasma density and magnetic field strength were enhanced,
8	particularly after the flow deflection was observed. The HFA lasted less than a minute, at
9	the lower edge of typical HFA durations.
10	
11	The HFA was associated with a discontinuity in the interplanetary magnetic field, and a
12	key formation criterion is that the solar wind convection electric field points into the
13	underlying discontinuity on at least one side [Thomsen et al., 1993; Schwartz et al.,
14	2000]. Since the EFI instrument [Bonnell et al., 2008] was not deployed on THEMIS-A,
15	frozen-in conditions were assumed and using Minimum Variance Analysis, the
16	convection electric field was found to point into the discontinuity on both sides with $ \mathbf{E}.\mathbf{n} $
17	= 1.9 mV/m beforehand and $ \mathbf{E}.\mathbf{n} $ = 0.8 mV/m afterwards ( $\mathbf{n}$ = [0.952 0.131 -0.275]). The
18	fluctuations in the magnetic field observed between the shock crossing and the HFA
19	correspond to foreshock wave activity [Eastwood et al., 2005], indicating that the
20	spacecraft was connected to oblique shock geometries, another important criterion
21	[Omidi and Sibeck, 2007]. THEMIS-A was close to the shock and the calculated
22	discontinuity only just intersects the model shock, suggesting that the HFA was in the
23	early stages of its evolution, consistent with its relatively short duration.

2	Figures 3(a) and 3(b) show 2D cuts of the 3D THEMIS-A ion distributions inside and
3	outside the HFA, relative to the magnetic field. Outside the HFA (3b), in the solar wind,
4	both the solar wind beam and field-aligned backstreaming foreshock ions were observed.
5	Inside the HFA (3a), the remnant solar wind is dominated by a sunward moving
6	population. The presence of multiple populations is consistent with the macroscale
7	features that suggest this HFA is relatively young.
8	
9	Figures 3(c) and 3(d) show similar cuts of the 3D electron distributions inside the HFA
10	and in the solar wind. The solar wind distribution measured at 10:27:35UT is anisotropic;
11	$T_{par}$ =1.48 $T_{perp}$ . Inside the HFA, at 10:26:00UT, the electrons are observed to be
12	essentially isotropic; $T_{par} = 0.97 T_{perp}$ . The parallel electron plasma beta inside the HFA
13	$\beta_{l/e} \sim 12$ . In this regime, the electron distribution is highly constrained towards isotropy
14	by the electron firehose instability ( $T_{par}/T_{perp} > 1$ ) and the whistler instability ( $T_{par}/T_{perp} < 1$ )
15	1) [ <i>Gary</i> , 1993]. For an anisotropy $T_{par}/T_{perp} = 1.48$ at $\beta_{l/e} = 12$ , for example, the linear
16	growth rate of the electron firehose instability $\gamma \sim 0.1  \Omega_e $ [Gary and Nishimura, 2003]
17	where the electron cyclotron frequency $\Omega_e = 351 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ if }  B  = 2 \text{ nT}$ (at the center of the
18	HFA). Thus, this instability will rapidly ( $\gamma \sim 35 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) render the distribution isotropic.
19	Figure 2(g) shows that wave activity is suppressed at the center of the HFA, consistent
20	with the fact that high electron beta instabilities will rapidly damp such fluctuations.
21	
22 23	2.2 Magnetosheath observations

Magnetosheath observations from THEMIS-E (closest to the shock) are shown in Figure
4. Between 10:26:30 UT and 10:28:00 UT THEMIS-E observed a complex series of

plasma structures containing flow deflections, density cavities, and hot plasma. This
interval can be divided into four sections. In interval 1, there is a clear correlated (fast
mode) enhancement in n and |B|. During interval 2, anti-correlated (slow mode)
fluctuations in n and |B| are accompanied by significant plasma heating and a flow
deflection. During interval 3, the magnetic field changes orientation several times and
there is a cavity in the |B|. Finally, in interval 4, n and |B| again exhibit correlated (fast
mode) enhancements.

8

9 The dynamic plasma pressure is reduced during interval 2; in fact, a simple pressure 10 balance calculation shows that the resulting subsolar magnetopause radius would move 11 from 9 Re to 12 Re. Interval 3 shows that the original underlying discontinuity has split 12 into a much more complex structure. It would appear that the region of flow deflection 13 and heating has become decoupled from the discontinuity. The presence of fast mode 14 perturbations at the edges, particularly on the leading edge, is consistent with theoretical 15 expectations. The slow mode rarefaction behind the leading fast mode perturbation is not 16 predicted by theory, but was observed in a recent study comparing ACE observations of a 17 solar wind discontinuity far upstream with Polar magnetosheath observations [Maynard 18 *et al.*, 2007].

19

THEMIS-C and –D (closely separated), near THEMIS-E (cf. Figure 1), observed some
plasma heating and a drop in the field strength, surrounded by fast mode density and field
enhancements. However, no significant flow deflection was observed. THEMIS-B,
furthest from the shock, saw no flow deflection or heating, although there were large

fluctuations in the field strength and some changes in the density in the vicinity of the
 central discontinuity.

3

5

### 4 **3. Ground-based observations**

There was a significant global magnetospheric response to this HFA. To illustrate this, 6 7 Figure 5 shows B<sub>H</sub> measured at 5 of the THEMIS ground based observatories [Mende et 8 al., 2008]. These 5 observatories all lie at a common geomagnetic latitude (60°N) and 9 spanning 87° in geomagnetic longitude. At the time of the HFA, the magnetometers were 10 arranged on the dawn flank of the magnetosphere (the THEMIS spacecraft were on the 11 dusk flank of the shock). A magnetic impulse event was observed to propagate across the 12 chain to progressively earlier magnetic local time, consistent with an anti-sunward 13 propagating signal. Therefore, the effects of the HFA propagated through the 14 magnetosheath to the magnetopause. 15 16 4. Conclusions 17 18 On 4 July 2007, THEMIS observed an HFA both up and downstream of the bow shock 19 simultaneously, the first time an HFA has been captured in this way. These observations 20 allowed the downstream structure of the HFA to be clearly identified in the context of the 21 upstream measurements, and determine the manner in which the upstream disruption is 22 transmitted through the shock. In addition, the THEMIS ground based observatories 23 showed that the HFA had a significant magnetospheric response.

1	THEMIS-A observed classical HFA signatures upstream of the bow shock. The electrons
2	appeared to be isotropic inside the upstream HFA because of the electron firehose
3	instability which grows extremely quickly under the observed conditions. The
4	downstream fluctuations at THEMIS-E were observed to be considerably more complex.
5	The fluctuation in the dynamic pressure appeared to be decoupled from the discontinuity,
6	which itself had decomposed into a series of structures. Based on simple calculations, the
7	dynamic pressure fluctuation observed by THEMIS-E in the magnetosheath is capable of
8	significantly perturbing the magnetopause. This is directly confirmed by the ground
9	based observations of an MIE propagating down the dawn flank.
10	
11	It would appear that this HFA was in the early stages of its evolution, which may explain
12	why THEMIS-B furthest from the shock, saw no flow deflection or heating. The
13	geometry of the encounter suggests that the discontinuity (and thus the HFA) first
14	touched the bow shock on the dusk flank where it was observed in-situ. The HFA is tied
15	to the point of contact between the discontinuity and the bow shock, which moves away
16	over the nose of the shock due to the convection of the discontinuity in the solar wind.
17	The absence of significant flow deflections at THEMIS-B implies it was too far away
18	from the shock to see the young HFA, and that subsequently, the HFA moved away from
19	the spacecraft faster than the flow disruption propagated towards the spacecraft.
20	Conversely, the movement of the HFA across the shock enabled the transmission of the
21	disturbance across the whole magnetosphere. Comparison with simulations, using these
22	data as boundary conditions, will enable a complete understanding of this event.

1 2 3

# 2 Acknowledgements

- 4 This work was supported by NASA grant NAS5-02099. We thank A. Roux and O.
- 5 LeContel for use of SCM data and K. H. Glassmeier, U. Auster and W. Baumjohann for
- 6 the use of FGM data provided under the lead of the Technical University of
- 7 Braunschweig and with financial support through the German Ministry for Economy and
- 8 Technology and the German Center for Aviation and Space (DLR) under contract 50 OC

### 1 **References**

2	Angelopoulos, V., et al. (2008), First results from the THEMIS mission, Space Sci. Rev., submitted
3	Auster, H. U., et al. (2008), The THEMIS fluxgate magnetometer, Space Sci. Rev., submitted
4	Bonnell, J. M., et al., (2008), Electric Field Instrument for THEMIS, Space Sci. Rev., submitted
5 6	Burgess, D., (1989), On the Effect of a Tangential Discontinuity on Ions Specularly Reflected at an Oblique Shock, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , 94, 472-478.
7 8	Eastwood, J. P., E. A. Lucek, C. Mazelle, K. Meziane, Y. Narita, J. S. Pickett, and R. A. Treumann, (2005), The Foreshock, <i>Space Sci.Rev.</i> , 118, 41-94.
9 10	Farris, M. H., S. M. Petrinec, and C. T. Russell, (1991), The Thickness of the Magnetosheath: Constraints on the Polytropic Index, <i>Geophys.Res.Lett.</i> , 18, 1821-1824.
11 12 13	Fuselier, S. A., M. F. Thomsen, J. T. Gosling, S. J. Bame, C. T. Russell, and M. M. Mellott, (1987), Fast shocks at the Edges of Hot Diamagnetic Cavities Upstream From the Earth's Bow Shock, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , 92, 3187-3194.
14	Gary, S. P., Theory of Space Plasma Microinstabilities, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
15 16	Gary, S. P. and K. Nishimura, (2003), Resonant electron firehose instability: Particle-in-cell simulations, <i>Phys.Plas.</i> , <i>10</i> , 3571-3576.
17 18	Koval, A., J. Safrankova, and Z. Nemecek, (2005), A study of particle flows in hot flow anomalies, <i>Planet.Space Sci.</i> , 53, 41-52.
19 20	Lucek, E. A., T. S. Horbury, A. Balogh, I. Dandouras, and H. Rème, (2004), Cluster observations of hot flow anomalies, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , 109, A06207-doi:10.1029/2003JA010016.
21 22 23	Maynard, N. C., et al. (2007), Interaction of the bow shock with a tangential discontinuity and solar wind density decrease: Observations of predicted fast mode waves and magnetosheath merging, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , <i>112</i> , A12219-doi:10.1029/2007JA012293.
24 25	McFadden, J. P., et al. (2008), Electrostatic analyzer for THEMIS and its inflight calibration, <i>Space Sci. Rev.</i> , submitted
26	Mende, S. B., et al. (2008), The THEMIS ground based observatory, Space Sci. Rev., submitted
27 28	Omidi, N. and D. G. Sibeck, (2007), Formation of hot flow anomalies and solitary shocks, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , <i>112</i> , A01203-doi:10.1029/2006JA011663.
29	Roux, A., et al. (2008). Searchcoil magnetometer for THEMIS. , Space Sci. Rev., submitted
30 31	Schwartz, S. J., (1995), Hot Flow Anomalies Near the Earth's Bow Shock, <i>Adv.Space Res.</i> , <i>15</i> , (8-9)107-(8/9)116.
32 33 34	Schwartz, S. J., G. Paschmann, N. Sckopke, T. M. Bauer, M. W. Dunlop, A. N. Fazakerley, and M. F. Thomsen, (2000), Conditions for the formation of Hot Flow Anomalies at the Earth's bow shock, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , 105, 12639-12650.
35 36	Sibeck, D. G., et al. (1999), Comprehensive study of the magnetospheric response to a hot flow anomaly, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , <i>104</i> , 4577-4593.

1 2	Sibeck, D. G., N. L. Borodkova, G. N. Zastenker, S. A. Romanov, and J. A. Sauvaud, (1998), Gross deformation of the dayside magnetopause, <i>Geophys.Res.Lett.</i> , 25, 453-456.
3 4	Sitar, R. J., et al. (1998), Multi-instrument analysis of the ionospheric signatures of a hot flow anomaly occuring on July 24, 1996, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , 103, 23357-23372.
5 6	Thomas, V. A., D. Winske, M. F. Thomsen, and T. G. Onsager, (1991), Hybrid Simulation of the Formation of a Hot Flow Anomaly, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , 96, 11625-11632.
7 8 9	Thomsen, M. F., V. A. Thomas, D. Winske, J. T. Gosling, M. H. Farris, and C. T. Russell, (1993), Observational Test of Hot Flow Anomaly Formation by the Interaction of a Magnetic Discontinuity with the Bow Shock, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , <i>98</i> , 15319-15330.
10 11	Völk, H. J. and RD. Auer, (1974), Motions of the Bow Shock Induced by Interplanetary Disturbances, <i>J.Geophys.Res.</i> , 79, 40-48.
12	Wu, B. H., M. E. Mandt, L. C. Lee, and J. K. Chao, (1993), Magnetospheric Response to Solar Wind

Wu, B. H., M. E. Mandt, L. C. Lee, and J. K. Chao, (1993), Magnetospheric Response to Solar Wind
 Dynamic Pressure Variations: Interaction of Interplanetary Tangential Discontinuities with the
 Bow Shock, *J.Geophys.Res.*, 98, 21297-21311.

1 **Figure Captions** 2

Figure 1 Location of the THEMIS probes at 10:26:00UT are shown, in GSE coordinates
(units of R<sub>E</sub>). A Farris model shock surface is shown. Only THEMIS-A was in the solar
wind.

- 6 Figure 2 THEMIS-A data. (a) Ion differential energy flux (eV/(cm<sup>2</sup> s ster eV) between 10 7 8 eV and 20 keV. (b, c) Magnetic field components in GSE and strength (d, e, f) Ion 9 plasma density, velocity and average temperature. (g) Magnetic field fluctuations from 10 filter bank data. THEMIS-A crossed the bow shock at 10:24:50UT (red dashed line) and 11 encountered the center of the HFA at 10:26:00UT. 12 13 Figure 3 2D cuts of the ion and electron plasma distributions recorded by THEMIS-A at 14 the center of the HFA and in the solar wind. The data are shown in magnetic field 15 coordinates. The thick black line points in the  $+x_{GSE}$  direction. In the ion distributions, the 16 thick red line points to the distribution maximum. 17 Figure 4 THEMIS-E data. (a) Ion differential energy flux (eV/(cm<sup>2</sup> s ster eV) between 10 18 19 eV and 20 keV. (b, c) Magnetic field components in GSE and strength (d, e, f) Ion 20 plasma density, velocity and average temperature. (g and h) Magnetic and electric field 21 fluctuations from filter bank data. THEMIS-E, in the magnetosheath, encountered a 22 complex series of fluctuations associated with the HFA. 23 24 Figure 5 B<sub>H</sub> measured at 5 of the THEMIS observatories located near 60°N geomagnetic
- 25 latitude. The propagation of the MIE is marked by the dashed line.

Probe	$[X, Y, Z] R_E (GSE)$
A	[10.86, 6.74, -3.47]
В	[9.11, 6.98, -3.09]
C	[9.66, 6.98, -3.23]
D	[9.67, 6.93, -3.22]
E	[9.84, 7.00, -3.29]

1 Table 1 Locations of the THEMIS probes at 10:26UT







2 Figure 2



Page 17 of 19



