

# Inferring the Interstellar Magnetic Field Direction from **Energetic Neutral Atom Observations of the Heliotail**

M. Kornbleuth<sup>1</sup>, M. Opher<sup>1</sup>, M. A. Dayeh<sup>2</sup>, J. M. Sokol<sup>2</sup>, D. L. Turner<sup>3</sup>, I. Baliukin<sup>4</sup>, K. Dialynas<sup>5</sup>, V. Izmodenov<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>Astronomy Department, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215, USA; <sup>2</sup>Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX 78228 USA; <sup>3</sup>Applied Physics Laboratory, Johns Hopkins University, Laurel, MD 20723, USA; <sup>4</sup>Space Research Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 117997, Russia; <sup>5</sup>Office of Space Research and Technology, Academy of Athens, 10679, Athens, Greece

## Overview

- Energetic Neutral Atoms (ENAs) can be used to indirectly study the structure of the heliosphere
- ENA imagers such as IBEX-Hi (0.52-6 keV) provide important observations of the heliosphere, but ENA models required to decipher
- ENA observations of the heliosphere have shown an evolution with solar cycle (McComas et al. 2020)
- ② Zirnstein et al. (2016a) identified a 5-lobe structure in IBEX-Hi ENA observations of the heliotail
- Dayeh et al. (2022) found a rotation of the heliotail lobes over the solar cycle To date, global ENA models have been unable to reproduce the inclination of the
- high latitude heliotail lobes, even when including solar cycle variations One key difference between the global ENA models is the
  - interstellar magnetic field (B<sub>ISM</sub>) used Lallement et al. (2005, 2010) constrained B<sub>ISM</sub> to lie in the hydrogen deflection plane (HDP) with respect to the pristine interstellar flow (herein,  $\alpha_{BV}$  is the angle between the  $B_{ISM}$  and interstellar flow directions in the HDP)
  - ② Zirnstein et al. (2016b) inferred the direction and magnitude of the B<sub>ISM</sub> by fitting the IBEX Ribbon center assuming a secondary ENA mechanism as the source ( $\alpha_{BV} = 40^\circ$ )
  - Izmodenov & Alexashov (2020) inferred the direction and magnitude of B<sub>ISM</sub> by determining which parameters best matched the Voyager termination shock and heliopause crossings in their kinetic-MHD solution ( $\alpha_{BV} = 20^\circ$ )
- Were we attempt to isolate the effect of the B<sub>ISM</sub> on the inclination of the heliotail lobes to infer the interstellar magnetic field characteristics



Figure 1. Cartoon depicting tail-centered Mollweide projection showing the inclination angle ( $\omega$ ) of the high latitude heliotail lobes, with  $\omega$  defined by the angle of the north/south lobes relative to the solar meridian.

- <sup>(2)</sup> We simulate the heliosphere using a kinetic-MHD solution (Michael et al. 2022) with different solar and interstellar conditions
- <sup>(2023)</sup> Using the ENA model from Kornbleuth et al. (2023), we produce synthetic ENA maps from each solution to compare with IBEX ENA observations
- <sup>(2)</sup> We compare the inclination of the heliotail lobe to determine the effect of different conditions on the evolution of the heliotail, and by extension to investigate the B<sub>ISM</sub> direction

Cases	Case	$\alpha_{BV}$	$B_{sw}$ [ $\mu$ G]	SW Profile	$\lambda_{NL}$	$\lambda_{SL}$	ω
	1	40°	29.4	2008	$102.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$	$78.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$	$14.0 \pm 3.5^{\circ}$
	2	$40^{\circ}$	44.4	2014	$96.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$	$84.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$5.0 \pm 2.5^{\circ}$
	3	$40^{\circ}$	29.4	Uniform	$102.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$78.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$14.0 \pm 3.5^{\circ}$
	4	$40^{\circ}$	64.5	Uniform	$96.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$	$84.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$5.4 \pm 2.7^{\circ}$
	5	60°	37.5	1995-2017	$102.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$78.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$14.0 \pm 3.5^{\circ}$
	6	$40^{\circ}$	37.5	1995-2017	$102.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$84.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$10.6 \pm 3.5^{\circ}$
	7	$20^{\circ}$	37.5	1995-2017	$102.0\pm3.0^\circ$	$90.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$	$6.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$
	8	$10^{\circ}$	37.5	1995-2017	$96.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$	$90.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$	$3.0 \pm 3.0^{\circ}$
	Data (12-13)				$86.6\pm1.8^\circ$	$84.9\pm2.6^\circ$	$1.2 \pm 2.5^{\circ}$
	Data (14-15)				$89.3 \pm 1.3^{\circ}$	$88.0\pm0.7^\circ$	$1.0 \pm 1.9^{\circ}$
	Data (16-17)				$83.4\pm0.2^\circ$	$83.4\pm0.3^\circ$	$0.1 \pm 0.4^{\circ}$

Table 1. Different cases utilized in this study. Included is the angle between the interstellar magnetic field and interstellar flow direction in the hydrogen deflection plane ( $\alpha_{BV}$ ), the solar magnetic field intensity ( $B_{sw}$ ), the solar wind profile, the longitude of the north ( $\lambda_{NI}$ ) and south ( $\lambda_{s_l}$ ) lobe centers, and the inclination angle of the lobes ( $\omega$ ) as described in Figure 1.

Cases 1-4: use same interstellar conditions but vary solar conditions <sup>(2)</sup> Cases 1 and 2 reflect yearly-averaged solar wind from IPS observations (Sokol et al. 2015) and solar magnetic field from OMNI for years 2008 (solar minimum) and 2014 (solar maximum), respectively Cases 3 and 4 have same uniform solar wind conditions (i.e. solar maximumlike) with different solar magnetic field intensity

Solution Cases 5-8: use identical solar-cycle averaged conditions at 1 au, but only change the B<sub>ISM</sub> direction, while keeping it in the hydrogen deflection plane <sup>(1)</sup> Keep B<sub>ISM</sub> magnitude constant for all cases since at lower limit of predicted magnitude range and higher B<sub>ISM</sub> intensity would only strengthen effect

### Both the Solar Wind and Interstellar Magnetic Field Influence the Tail Case 1: Case 2: Case 6: Case 5: 2008 Avg. (Solar Minimum) 2014 Avg. (Solar Maximum) 22-year Avg. Solar Wind Bsw,r=29.4 μG; α<sub>BV</sub>=40° Bsw,r=44.4 μG; α<sub>BV</sub>=40° Bsw,r=37.5 μG; α<sub>BV</sub>=60° Energy = 4.29 keVEnergy = 4.29 keVEnergy = 4.29 keVEnergy = 4.29 keV 0.78 1.00 0.10 Case 8: Case 7: Case 4: Case 3: 22-year Avg. Solar Wind Uniform Solar Wind Uniform Solar Wind Bsw,r=37.5 μG; α<sub>BV</sub>=20° Bsw,r=64.5 μG; α<sub>BV</sub>=40° Bsw,r=29.4 μG; α<sub>BV</sub>=40° Energy = 4.29 keVEnergy = 4.29 keVEnergy = 4.29 keV Energy = 4.29 keV

Figure 2. Evolution of the north/south lobe centers with changing solar wind profile and solar magnetic field (maps on left) and with changing B<sub>ISM</sub> direction (maps on right). Different cases included are listed in Table 1. Cases 1-4 have identical interstellar conditions, while Cases 5-8 have identical solar wind and magnetic field conditions.





Ecliptic Long. [deg] Figure 3. Top: evolution of lobe centers with varying solar wind and solar magnetic field conditions. Bottom: evolution of lobe centers with varying B<sub>ISM</sub> angle.

- on solar wind profile

## References

Dayeh, M., et al., 2022, ApJS, 261, 27 Izmodenov, V. & Alexashov, D., 2020, A&A, 644, L12 Kornbleuth, M., et al., 2023, ApJL, 944, L47 Lallement, R., et al., 2005, Science, 307, 1447 Lallement, R., et al., 2010, 12<sup>th</sup> ISW, 1216, 555

## Contact

Marc Kornbleuth Department of Astronomy



## Lobe centers rotate with varying solar wind conditions, but the centers have larger dependence on solar magnetic field intensity than

Case of solar minimum (i.e. weak solar magnetic field) trends towards maximum inclination of the heliotail

<sup>(1)</sup> Different B<sub>ISM</sub> orientations influence the inclination of the lobes **With averaged solar wind/magnetic field conditions**,  $0^{\circ} < \alpha_{BV} < 20^{\circ}$ gives best agreement with observations

> McComas, D., et al., 2017, ApJS, 229, 41 Michael, A., et al., 2022, ApJ, 924, 105 Sokol, J., et al., 2015, Sol. Phys., 290, 2589 Zirnstein, E., et al., 2016a, ApJ, 826, 58 Zirnstein, E., et al., 2016b, ApJL, 818, L18 This work was partially supported by NASA grant 18 Drive18\_2-0029, Our Heliospheric SHIELD, 80NSSC22M0164 and NAGA HGI 80NSSC22K0525

