Electric Field Variability and Impact on the Thermosphere

Yue Deng¹ Astrid Maute², Arthur Richmond²

¹University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas ²NCAR/HAO



Motivation:





$$Q_J \propto \overline{E^2} = \overline{E}^2 + \sigma_E^2$$

Codrescu et al., [1995]

The quantitative application of GCMs for predictive purposes is limited by uncertainties in the energy inputs

➢How big is the E-field variability and what's the effect to the energy input? (Codrescu et al., [1995], Crowley & Hackert, [2001], Matsuo et al., [2003] and so on.)

Empirical model of the Electric Field variability:



Based on the DE2 E-field data set

E-field variability/standard deviation of East and North components referred to the average empirical model

➤ IMF clock angle dependence with Bt=5 nT at equinox

Comparison of energy input into GCM:



Coupled E-field variability model into TIEGCM

 \succ The E-field variability increases the energy input by > 100%.

> The total Joule heating has a good agreement with Poynting flux.

➤ The inconsistent particle precipitation makes the JH higher than Poynting flux in the solstice.

[Deng et al., 2008]

Energy distribution (Equinox):



- > Altitude integrated Joule heating and Poynting flux from the topside.
- E-field variability increases JH significantly.

> Total Joule heating has a similar distribution as Poynting flux, with some detailed difference at the polar cap, cusp and nightside.

Temperature response:





E-field variation causes >100 K temperature increase above 300 km.

> Spatial dependency of the E-field variation phase doesn't matter much for the temperature.





- The E-field variability increases the energy input by > 100%. The total Joule heating has a good agreement with Poynting flux.
- The total Joule heating has a similar distribution as Poynting flux, with some detailed differences at the polar cap, cusp and nightside.
- E-field variation causes >100 K temperature increase at 400 km.



Qingyu Zhu's poster on Wednesday