Nature and Properties of Electrostatic Solitary Waves in the Earth's Magnetosheath

Zubair Shaikh^{*1} and Ivan Vasko²

(Email: <u>zshaikh@berkeley.edu</u>)

1. Space Sciences Laboratory, UC Berkeley, CA, USA; 2. William B. Hanson Center for Space Sciences, UTD, Richardson, TX, USA



Website

- nonlinear, localized, bipolar electric field the background magnetic field ¹⁻¹⁵.
- Solitons: Electron/Ion solitons,
- ESWs plays an important role in plasma transport, particle scattering, and energy exchange processes^{1,2, 15}.



Selection Criteria

1. At least **one pair of voltage probe** must show:

• $cc \ge 0.85$

• $\delta t \geq 0.06 \, msec$

2.
$$E_L \gg E_M$$
, E_N which is equivalent to $\frac{\lambda_{max}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{int}^2 + \lambda_{min}^2}} > 5$

Table 1. List of Magnetosheath, duration, turbulent level, number of observed IHs/EHs by MMS1 & MMS2.

Magnetosheath Interval	Duration	Turbulence	#IHs		#EHs	
Date and Time	Δ <i>T</i> (min)	$\delta B_{rms}/B_0$	MMS1	MMS2	MMS1	MMS2
Oct 31, 2015; 10:22:27 to 10:27:00	04.55	0.64	134	194	54	91
Jan 27, 2017; 00:55:03 to 00:56:58	01.92	1.05	105	122	277	269
Jan 27, 2017; 00:57:23 to 01:03:13	05.83	2.46	191	362	103	241
Total			430	678	434	601
			IHs = 1108		EHs = 1035	

Analysis and Results



Spatial Scale (half-width)





Science objectives

- Which Solitary waves are often present within the Magnetosheath?
- What are the properties and generation mechanism of solitary waves?
- How does turbulence level affects characteristics and occurrence of ESWs?

Median = 0.55bal 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.05 0.05 0.05 15 $\theta_{kB} \ [deg]$ $E_0 = E_{pp}/2 \, \left[mV/m ight]$ $au_{pp} \hspace{0.1 cm} [ms]$

Figure 5: Distributions of solitary waves properties (*black*: *positive potential structures*, *red*: *negative potential structures*).

Data and Methodology

- MMS S/C: FPI (Ions:150ms, electrons:30ms), FGM (128Hz), EDP (8192 Hz), and SCM (8192 Hz).
- Methodology^{13,15-16}:
- Minimum Variance Analysis (MVA)
- Voltage Interferometry Analysis
- Assuming locally planar and one dimensional solitary wave ¹³⁻¹⁸
- Solitary wave speed; $V_s = \frac{E_{ij} l_{ij}}{\Delta t_{ii}}$ here, \hat{E}_{ii} is polarization direction
- Electrostatic potential; $\varphi = \int E_L V_s dt$
- Spatial scale of solitary structure; $x = \int V_s dt;$ with x = 0, corresponding to $E_L = 0$.



Interferometry Analysis

 $_{12} = 112 \ km/s$

 $cc_{34} = 0.98$

 $\varphi = \int E_L V_s dt$

1.5

0.5



Figure 6: 1D reduced IVDFs $F(V_k)$ in the plasma frame collected over 150 ms around the solitary waves. The grey color distribution is for individual solitary waves, whereas the overplotted black curves present average distributions. Each $F(V_k)$ is normalized with peak value F_{max} and translated into the plasma frame and normalized to ion thermal speed V_{Ti} . The histograms present normalized probability distributions of solitary wave speed in the plasma frame.





Summary and Conclusions

Statistically analysis >2,100 ESWs within the three Earth's Magnetosheath crossings having different turbulence amplitude:

- About 48% of the ESWs are electron holes (EHs), whereas 52% are ion holes (IHs).
- EHs and IHs have similar properties such as; spatial scales of a few Debye lengths, plasma frame velocities within about 200 km/s, and potential amplitudes < 2 V.
- EHs and IHs are slow, their plasma frame speeds are much smaller than local electron thermal speed, but comparable with local ion thermal speed.
- The cluster of EHs are statistically well-separated from clusters of IHs, strongly indicates that the solitary waves of different polarities are highly likely produced by instabilities operating separately in time or space.
- Characteristics & occurrence of EHs/IHs are **insensitive to local turbulence intensity**.

7: The probability and Figure Cumulative distribution functions of time intervals between sequentially observed EHs and IHs.

References

	Schamel, H. 1986, Physics reports, 140(3), 161-191.	
	Graham et. al., 2016, JGR, 121(4), 3069–3092.	
	Hutchinson, I. H. 2017, POP, 24(5), 055601.	
	Mozer et. al., 2018, PRL, 121(13), 135102.	
	Vasko et al., 2018, GRL., 45(12), 5809–5817.	
	Vasko et. al., 2018, POP, 25(7), 072903.	
	Holmes et. al., 2018, JGR, 123(1), 132–145	
	Wang et. al., 2020, ApJL, 889(1), L9.	
	Vasko et al 2020, Frontiers in Physics, 8, 156.	
).	Kamaletdinov et al., 2021, PRL, 127(16), 165101.	
1.	Wang et. al., 2021, JGR, 126(7), e29357.	
2	Kamaletdinov et al., 2022, POP, 29(9).	
3.	Steinvall et al., 2022, JGR, 127(3), e2021JA030143	
1.	Wang et al., 2022, GRL, 49(8), e2022GL097919.	
5.	Shaikh et al., 2024, JGR, 129, e2023JA032059.	

Acknowledgement

The work of Z.S. and I.V. was supported by NASA Grant 80NSSC20K1325 and NSF Grant 2026680. The work of I.V. was Grant 80NSSC22K1634. We thanks MMS team for providing data

