Studying the Earth's Magnetopause at High Latitudes With Cluster

N. Grimmich (1), F. Plaschke (1), C. P. Escoubet (2), M. Archer (3), R. Nakamura (4), D. G. Sibeck (5), O. D. Constantinescu (1) (1) Institut für Geophysik und extraterrestrische Physik, TU Braunschweig, Germany; (2) ESA European Space Research and Technology Centre, Noordwijk, Netherlands; (3) Department of Physics, Imperial College London, UK; (4) Institut für Weltraumforschung, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaft, Graz, Austria; (5) NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, US Contact: n.grimmich@tu-braunschweig.de | Telefon +49 (0) 531 391-5221 | https://www.tu-braunschweig.de/en/igep/mitglieder/grimmich

1. Motivation:

- The magnetopause (MP) is an important boundary
- MP location and dynamic mostly **influenced by solar wind (SW)** pressure and IMF
- Response of the MP to the SW **not yet fully understood**
- Under special circumstances observation and prediction of MP locations can deviate drastically
- Multi-spacecraft constellation are providing insights in the MP dynamics
- Many studies are focused on equatorial plane
- Full picture of the response only when higher latitudes are included
- The Cluster mission (*Escoubet et al., 2001*) with spacecraft in polar orbits can be used for such studies



Fig. 1: Cluster and GOES orbit in cylindrical coordinates. Different observation regions IMF, purple: (yellow: marked magnetosheath; grey (GOES) and green (Cluster): magnetosphere). Observed and predicted MP (red) and BS (blue) positions are indicated by solid and dashed lines, respectively. Adapted from Fig. 2 of Tátrallyay et al. (2012).



Fig. 2: Cluster polar orbit (red colour) compared with orbits of other multi-spacecraft missions in ecliptic orbits (THEMIS in green colour and MMS in blue colour). Adapted from Fig. 5 of *Haaland et* al. (2021).

2. Data and Methods:

- Cluster data (Escoubet et al., 2001) between 2001 and 2020
- FGM and CIS-HIA for C1 and C3 resampled to 1 min
- Primarily **Multi-spacecraft timing method** for MP normal estimation on 5VPS FGM data
- 1 min OMNI data for SW monitoring and input to Shue et al. (1998) model prediction
- Use **MP stand-off distance for comparison** between observation and model



Technische Universität Braunschweig

References:

Escoubet et al. (2001): Introduction: The Cluster mission. Ann. Geophys., https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-19-1197-2001 Grimmich et al. (2023): Study of extreme magnetopause distortions under varying solar wind conditions. JGR: Space Physics, https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JA031603 Haaland et al. (2021): 20 years of Cluster observations: The magnetopause. JGR: Space Physics, https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JA029362 Shue et al. (1998): Magnetopause location under extreme solar wind conditions, JGR, https://doi.org/10.1029/98JA01103 Tátrallyay et al. (2012): Multi-spacecraft observations of the terrestrial bow shock and magnetopause during extreme solar wind disturbances, Ann. Geophys., https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-30-1675-2012

3. Magnetopause Dataset:

Machine Learning method adapted from Grimmich et al. (2023)

All identified (proper) MPCs: C1 22,357 (12,021); C3 15,965 (8,692)

Proper dayside **MPCs in high latitudes: 6,183** (57 expanded MPCs, 1,642 compressed MPCs)

High-latitude MPCs with large deviations from Shue et al. (1998) model: **57 expanded MPCs** (positive deviation) and **1,482 compressed MPCs** (negative deviation)

Validated with Geospace Region and Magnetospheric Boundary (GRMB) dataset (ST2.1 Poster X3.39) \rightarrow up to 77 % agreement





Fig. 5: Comparison of the distributions of different solar wind parameters associated with the observation of MPCs. shows the panel Each distributions associated with the unusually extended MPCs (cyan), and the unusually MPCs compressed (red). distributions These are normalised by division by the normal solar wind occurrence distribution the Of corresponding parameter, favourable revealing conditions for the occurrence of unusual MPCs.

Fig. 6: Comparison of the distributions of different solar wind parameters associated with the observation of MPCs in the THEMIS dataset, identical to Fig. 5. Modified from Fig. 9 of Grimmich et al. (2023).

Details on THEMIS MPCs:



Dataset:

5. High Latitude Magnetopause Analysis:



Fig. 7: Normalised distributions of different MPC subsets showing results derived from the multi-spacecraft timing method: (a) shows the total angular deviations between the estimated and the Shue et al. (1998) model predicted MP normals; (b) shows the angle between the estimated MP normals and the magnetic field vectors in the magnetosheath; (c) shows the MP velocity distributions.

6. Conclusions:

• High-latitude MP motion ...

- ... is, on average, faster earthward than sunward

- high and equatorial latitudes
- and SW velocities

Acknowledgements: This Project is supported by the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) on the basis of a decision by the German Bundestag.









Fig. 3: Panel a) shows the spatial distribution of the identified MPCs in a (x, x)plane. The dashed black line shows the MP model of Shue et al. (1998). Panel b) shows the distribution of spacecraft positions during the MPCs in latitude over longitude. Panel c) shows the histogram of the crossing probability/quality value for all MPCs (high probability > 0.75 in green and low probability ≤ 0.75



Fig. 4: Distribution of our identified GRMB dataset the bv (ST2.1 Poster X3.39)

regions

• ... seems to be more often associated with a closed MP boundary (66 % of cases) • Unusually compressed MPCs are more likely to have distorted high-latitude MP surfaces • Occurrence rates of unusual MP locations beyond the Shue et al. (1998) model similar at

• Expanded MPCs occur more frequent under quasi-radial IMF, higher Alfvén Mach numbers

• Compressed MPCs occur more frequent under southward IMF and higher SW velocities



