Multi-Scale Investigations of Flux transfer events (FTEs) and Kelvin-Helmholtz waves/vortices (KHWs/KHVs)

Kyoung-Joo ('Joo') Hwang (1)

Eunjin Choi (1), Kyunghwan Dokgo (1), J. L. Burch (1), D. G. Sibeck (2), B. L. Giles (2), C. J. Pollock (3), R. Fear (4), T.K.M. Nakamura (5), H. Fu (6), C. P. Escoubet (7), S. Toledo-Redondo (8), B. Lauvrad (8), Y. Khotyaintsev (9), D. Graham (9), C. Norgren (10), X. Ma (11), D. Gershman (2), R. E. Ergun (12), R. B. Torbert (13), J. C. Dorelli (2), L. Avanov (2), W. R. Paterson (2), C. T. Russell (14), and R. J. Strangeway (14) + ISSI MMS-Cluster RX team

(1) Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX
(2) NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD

(3) Denali Scientific, LLC, Alaska, AK
(4) University of Southampton, UK

(5) Austrian Academy of Sciences, Space Research Institute, Vienna, Austria

(6) School of Science and Environment, Beihang University, China
(7) European Space Research and Technology Centre, Noordwijk, Netherlands

(8) Institut de Recherche en Astrophysique et Planétologie, CNRS, UPS, CNES, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France

(9) Swedish Institute of Space Physics, Uppsala, Sweden
(10) University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

(11) Physical Sciences Department, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach, FL
(2) Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO

(13) Space Science Center, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH

(14) Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA

Acknowledgements: MMS FPI, Fields, EPD, and Theory/Modeling teams

Multi-Scale Investigations of Flux transfer events (FTEs) and

Kelvin-Helmholtz waves/vortices (KHWs/KHVs)

Kyoung-Joo ('Joo') Hwang (1)

Eunjin Choi (1), Kyunghwan Dokgo (1), J. L. Burch (1), D. G. Sibeck (2), B. L. Giles (2), C. J. Pollock (3), R. Fear (4), T.K.M. Nakamura (5), H. Fu (6), C. P. Escoubet (7), S. Toledo-Redondo (8), B. Lauvrad (8), Y. Khotyaintsev (9), D. Graham (9), C. Norgren (10), X. Ma (11), D. Gershman (2), R. E. Ergun (12), R. B. Torbert (13), J. C. Dorelli (2), L. Avanov (2), W. R. Paterson (2), C. T. Russell (14), and R. J. Strangeway (14) + ISSI MMS-Cluster RX team

(1) Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX
(2) NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD

(3) Denali Scientific, LLC, Alaska, AK
(4) University of Southampton, UK

(5) Austrian Academy of Sciences, Space Research Institute, Vienna, Austria

(6) School of Science and Environment, Beihang University, China
(7) European Space Research and Technology Centre, Noordwijk, Netherlands

(8) Institut de Recherche en Astrophysique et Planétologie, CNRS, UPS, CNES, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France

(9) Swedish Institute of Space Physics, Uppsala, Sweden
(10) University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

(11) Physical Sciences Department, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach, FL
(2) Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO

(13) Space Science Center, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH

(14) Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA

Acknowledgements: MMS FPI, Fields, EPD, and Theory/Modeling teams

Outline

- 1. FTE: general knowns
- 2. Reconnection-based FTE models
- 3. New findings on FTE after MMS
- 4. Velocity-shear-induced FTE

Outline

- 1. FTE: general knowns
- 2. Reconnection-based FTE models
- 3. New findings of FTE after MMS
- 4. Velocity-shear-induced FTE

FTE: Initial In-situ Observation



Magnetosheath

- Identified bipolar B_n signature & |B| enhancement
- Interpreted as signature of localized flux ropes, 'flux transfer events'

FTE: B_n polarity representing a motion - 1



FTE: B_n **polarity representing a motion - 2**



- Standard polarity (positive => negative; X): predominantly in the northern hemisphere
- Reverse polarity (negative => positive; •): predominantly in the souhern hemisphere
- Indicative of subsolar reconnection as a generation mechanism (even when there is a dominant IMF By condition, leading to guide-field reconnection [Russell+, 1985])

FTE: IMF Bz dependence



- Subsolar and pre/post-noon FTEs are observed mainly during southward IMF [Kuo+ 1995; Kawano & Russell, 1997a,b]
- Post-terminator FTEs are associated with strongly northward IMF [Kawano & Russell, 1997a,b] <= high-latitude reconnection for IMF +Bz
- FTE event from Cluster shows an tailward/equatorward motion during IMF +Bz

FTE: IMF By dependence



[Kawano & Russell, 1997a; left] [Fuselier+, 2016; right] cusp Cusp Cusp

B_y dependence for strong IMF +Bz [Kawano & Russell, 1997b]

 Southward and slightly northward IMF: Most of events are explained by a tilted subsolar component RX

 More northward IMF: Cusp reconnection explains polarities and IMF By dependence.

FTE: Motion – Magnetosheath Flow Effect



 118 FTE statistics from Cluster show consistency in both direction and speed with either V_{HTN} or V_{HTS} calculated from the Cooling model [Fear+, 2007]



FTE: Cusp responses



- Steady-state reconnection leads to dispersion pattern of precipitating ions in the cusp region (lowest time of flight from X, for highest energy ions): For subsolar RX, decrease in ion energies with latitude
- Pulses in reconnection cause discrete steps (red arrows) in ion dispersion
- Evidence for the fact that reconnection takes place in a series of bursts, therefore, producing FTEs

[Courtesy to R. Fear]

FTE: Ionospheric Responses



- At the footprints of newly opened magnetic field lines
- Optically, as Poleward Moving Auroral Forms (PMAF) [Sandholt+ 1986; 1992]
- In radar, as Pulsed Ionospheric Flows or Poleward Moving Radar Auroral Forms [Provan+ 1998; McWiliams+, 2000]
- Conjugate studies between In-situ and ground-based observations [Elphic+ 1990; Amm+, 2005; Wild+ 2005; 2007]
- Neudegg+ [2001]: In-situ (a)
 + Radar (b) + Optical (c-f)
 conjunctions

[Courtesy to R. Fear]

Outline

- 1. FTE: general knowns
- 2. Reconnection-based FTE models
- 3. New findings on FTE after MMS
- 4. Velocity-shear-induced FTE

FTE: Other Reconnection-based Models



Elbow-shaped flux bundle FTEs Russell & Elphic [1979] Multiple X-line FTEs Lee & Fu [1985] Single X-line FTEs Southwood [1988] Scholer [1988]

FTE: Seasonal dependence (SMXR model)



- In presence of dipolar tilt, FTEs are formed by sequential multiple X-line reconnection (SMXR)
- FTEs move preferentially to the **winter** hemisphere
- SMXR: not present in all related simulation works
- Korotova+ [2008] showed FTEs detected by Interball-1 around June solstice in 1996-1999 are found exclusively in winter hemisphere



FTE: Signatures of Elbow-shaped flux-bundle FTEs



(b)

Formed by localized patchy reconnection

B topology:

- Topologically open
- The spiral magnetic field lines connect the magnetosheath magnetic field to either the northern or southern high-latitude ionosphere
- Their magnetosheath and magnetospheric ends connect through a circular hole (with a diameter of ~1 R_E) on the magnetopause

Extent:

 Having narrow azimuthal (dawn-dusk) extents

Particle signature:

- Bidirectional electrons at the edge of FTEs
- Mostly unidirectional ions in the rearward edge of the FTE [Varsani+, 2014]
- Hot and more isotropic electrons in the FTE core

FTE: Signatures of Single X-line Model





Via transient increases in the reconnection rate

B topology:

- Topologically open; no helical flux rope
- May contain a core guide field
- The newly reconnected magnetic field lines simply connect the magnetosheath to either the northern or southern hemisphere.

Extent:

• Can extend azimuthally over many R_E

Particle signature:

- Reconnection jets flow away from the X-line on the edges of FTEs
- Thermalized plasma populate within the core
- The particle signatures similar to Elbowshaped FTEs
- Lockwood and Hapgood [1998]: continuous variation in the ion distribution function between the event core (reconnected earlier) and the draped field lines (reconnected later)

FTE: Signatures of Multiple X-line Model - 1



Via simultaneous or sequential multiple X-lines

B topology:

- Possibly topologically closed
 - Mixed magnetic field topologies, e.g., open field lines connecting the northern or southern hemisphere to the magnetosheath, closed field lines connecting both hemispheres, and purely magnetosheath fields [Pu+ 2013; Zhong+, 2013]



FTE: Signatures of Multiple X-line Model - 2



Via simultaneous or sequential multiple X-lines

Extent:

Can extend azimuthally over many R_E

Particle signature:

- Two ion jets converging toward the center of such FTEs [Hasegawa+, 2010; Øieroset+, 2011]
- Heated magnetosheath electrons flowing both parallel and antiparallel to B [Hasegawa+, 2010]



FTE: Crater FTEs



More complex shape in |B| enhancement:

- **'M'- shaped:** central depression in |B|
- **'W'-shaped**: strong core bounded by weak |B|

Scenarios:

- Pressure pulses-causing transient relocation of the spacecraft across the boundary layer with respect to an FTE [Sibeck & Smith, 1992; Owen+, 2008]
- Encounters with the separatrix resulting in the crater-like *B* variations with bipolar B_n across the event [Farrugia+, 2011]





FTE: Multi-spacecraft observations before MMS

Distinguishing among different models:

- Fear et al. [2008] used tetrahedral Cluster observations to describe an FTE with a much larger azimuthal than north-south extent, which is inconsistent with the elbow-shaped flux tube model.
- **Dunlop et al. [2005]** presented **Cluster** and **TC-1** observations of a pair of FTEs propagating northward and southward away from the reconnection site, consistent with single X-line model.
- Hasegawa et al. [2010] reported THEMIS observation of an FTE between two converging jets, and therefore suggested multiple X-line model (Grad-Shafranov reconstruction using multi-s/c measurements).
- Farrugia et al. [2011] reported a single X-line crater FTE with multiple layers on the basis of their magnetic, electric, and plasma signatures from the four **Cluster** spacecraft.

Magnetic topology using B-field and electron measurements on improved temporal resolution:

- **Owen et al. [2001]** used Cluster-FGM/PEACE observations to define the magnetic field connectivity of the substructure of FTEs inferred from the magnetic field and electron signatures.
- Øieroset et al. [2011] presented observations of electrons that were not trapped within the FTE, demonstrating that the event was three-dimensional and had an open magnetic field topology.
- Pu et al. [2013], Zhong et al. [2013] used energy-dependent electron pitch angle distributions to show mixed magnetic field topologies of a multiple X-line FTE.
- Varsani et al. [2014] identified the multi-layer interior and surrounding structures of a crater FTE based on the electron pitch angles using 125 ms observations of Cluster-PEACE measurements assuming that the electrons were gyrotropic.

FTE: Multi-spacecraft observations before MMS



Magnetic topology using B-field and electron measurements on high time resolution:

• Varsani et al. [2014] identified the multi-layer interior and surrounding structures of a crater FTE based on the electron pitch angles using 125-ms observations of Cluster-PEACE measurements assuming that the electrons were gyrotropic.

Outline

- 1. FTE: general knowns
- 2. Reconnection-based FTE models
- 3. New findings on FTE after MMS
- 4. Velocity-shear-induced FTE

FTE: After MMS - 1. Substructure



FTE: After MMS - 1. Substructure



FTE: After MMS - 2. Force balance



Force-free flux rope [Lundquist, 1950]: J x B = 0, i.e., J parallel to B

- ⇒ B curvature (green) is balanced by B pressure force (orange)
- FTE2 (left)
 - B curvature is balanced by B pressure force
- FTE3 (right)
 - **B** curvature is NOT balanced by **B** pressure force
 - Ion pressure force (cyan) is dominant
 - \blacktriangleright Force balanced between J x B and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P}$

 $\rho \frac{\mathsf{D} \boldsymbol{u}}{\mathsf{D} t} = \boldsymbol{j} \times \boldsymbol{B} - \nabla \boldsymbol{\cdot} \boldsymbol{P}$

FTE: After MMS - 2. Force Balance



FTE: After MMS - 3. Small scale FTEs



FTE: After MMS - 3 Small-scale FTEs



FTE: After MMS - 4. Coalescence of small-scale FTEs



Outline

- 1. FTE: general knowns
- 2. Reconnection-based FTE models
- 3. New findings on FTE after MMS
- 4. Velocity-shear-induced FTE

Velocity-shear induced FTE



Dorelli & Bhattacharjee [2009]



Velocity-shear induced FTE: electron-vortex induced FTE





Zhong+ [2018]

Velocity-shear induced FTE: 3-D PIC simulation



[Nakamura+, 2017; Courtesy to T.K.M Nakamura]

Velocity-shear induced FTE: Comparison with Obs.





- Para electron heating
- Thin current sheet
- No ion jet
- No ele. Jet
- Current sustained by electorn flow
- Strong E_M`
 (more than 5 times
 larger than 0.1 rate)
- d_e-scale strong

[Courtesy to T.K.M Nakamura]

KHV+FTE: FTE detected at the KHV boundary



KHV+FTE: FTE detected at the KHV boundary



- Non-zero J dot E'

KHV+FTE: FTE detected at the KHV boundary



Summary

FTE

Knowns

- General structure, motion, and extent
- IMF dependence
- Different models leading to different topology
- Substructure (partly)

Unknowns

- Substructure (further details, variations)
- Energy conversion (partly answered by MMS)
- What regulates the contraction or expansion of FTEs? (related to force balance?)
- The relationship with ion/electron flow vortex

Outline

- 1. FTE: general knowns
- 2. Reconnection-based FTE models
- 3. New findings of FTE after MMS
- 4. Velocity-shear-induced FTE

Thank you!