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Magnetospheric Plasma Pressures in the Midnight Meridian: Observations From 2.5 to 35 RE
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Plasma pressure data from the ISEE 2 fast plasma experiment (FPE) were statistically analyzed to determine the plasma sheet pressure versus distance in the midnight local time sector of the near-earth (12-35 RE) magnetotail plasma sheet. The observed plasma pressure, assumed isotropic, was mapped along model magnetic field flux tubes (obtained from the Tsyganenko and Usmanov [1982] model) to the magnetic equator, sorted according to latitude and mapped to the midnight local time sector. In regions (L > 12 RE) where the bulk of the plasma pressure was contributed by particles in the energy range of the FPE (70 eV to 40 keV for ions), the statistically determined peak plasma pressures vary with distance similarly to previously determined lobe magnetic pressures (i.e., in a time-averaged sense, pressure balance normal to the magnetotail magnetic equator in the midnight meridian is maintained between lobe magnetic and plasma sheet plasma pressures). Additional plasma pressure data obtained in the inner magnetosphere (2.5 < L < 7) by the Explorer 45, ATS 5, and AMPTE CCE spacecraft supplement the ISEE 2 data. Estimates of plasma pressures in the "transition" region (7-12 RE), where the magnetic field topology changes rapidly from an equatorial dipolar to a tail-like configuration, are compared with the observed pressure profiles. The quiet time "transition" region pressure estimates, obtained previously from inversions of empirical magnetospheric field models, are consistent with the ISEE 2 data when adjusted for the magnetic field orientations of the "transition" region. Quiet spin observations and estimates are combined to track profiles of the equatorial plasma pressure along the midnight meridian between 2.5 and 35 RE.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the quiet magnetosphere, the electromagnetic forces acting on the plasma contained within the magnetic field are expected to be in near equilibrium with gradients of the plasma pressure. Thus, the configuration of the equilibrium magnetosphere is determined by the magnetic field of the Earth, the solar wind external to the cavity and by the plasma trapped within the cavity which is an internal current source. Several global magnetospheric magnetic field models have been developed to describe the magnetic fields and current systems within the magnetospheric cavity. The best semi-empirical models, based upon a vast data base of magnetometer measurements gathered over the last two decades, provide quantitative descriptions valid over large portions of the system. Because the electrical current is proportional to the curl of the magnetic field, the models also implicitly contain information on the electromagnetic forces. Therefore if magnetohydrodynamic momentum balance is assumed, magnetic field models can be used to infer the distributions of plasma consistent with the field configuration [Walker and Southwood, 1982; Spence et al., 1987].

Modeling techniques have not been widely applied extensively to plasma pressure measurements principally because the data have not been sufficiently comprehensive. Some studies have characterized the plasma pressure in limited energy ranges and/or spatial regions, but models require more complete data sets. In this paper, we use ISEE 2 data to establish radial profiles of averaged plasma pressures as a function of magnetic activity in the near-midnight magnetotail. By supplementing the ISEE 2 results with previously published results we obtain plasma pressure profiles for radial distances from 2.5 RE to 35 RE. Determination of the average plasma properties may contribute to the eventual synthesis of field and plasma data into a comprehensive empirical description of the magnetosphere.

2. OBSERVATIONS

2.1. ISEE 2 Fast Plasma Experiment

Data from the ISEE 2 fast plasma experiment (FPE) were analyzed to determine the average distribution of plasma pressures in the magnetotail. The ISEE 2 FPE was made up of three 90° spherical section electrostatic analyzers. Two "back-to-back" detectors sampled the full two-dimensional (2D) velocity distribution of both ions and electrons during each spacecraft spin period (about 3 s). The third FPE detector measured the full three dimensional (3D) distribution over a somewhat longer period (eight spin periods). Because no ion mass discrimination was available, the ion distributions were analyzed assuming that all the ions were protons. The FPE system was operated in one of two energy modes: MS/M or SW/MS. The former mode was designed for measuring the magnetosphere, magnetopause and inner magnetosheath, while the latter mode was for the solar wind, bow shock, and outer magnetosheath regions. For the present study, only data from the MS/M mode were investigated. The energy ranges covered in this mode were 70 eV to 40 keV for the ions and 12 eV to 20 keV for the electrons. The reader is urged to consult Bame et al. [1978] for a more complete description.

The ISEE 2 spacecraft was launched on October 22, 1977, into
Fig. 1. An example of the 2D velocity moments derived from the FPE on ISEE 2 for April 12, 1979. Ion distributions are analyzed assuming that all ions are protons. Solid (dotted) curves are, from top to bottom, the proton (electron) number density \( (\text{cm}^{-3}) \), 2D temperature (eV), flow speed (km s\(^{-1}\)), flow azimuth (degrees), and pressure \( (\times 10^{-8} \text{ dynes cm}^{-2}) \). The slowly varying pressure, most clearly present as the spacecraft moves earthward between 1000 UT to 1400 UT, is taken to represent the steady-state plasma sheet pressure in this analysis.
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Fig. 2. Plots of plasma pressure versus location obtained by the ISEE 2 FPE during the period of March 25 to April 25, 1979.
During this interval, ISEE 2 was near the midnight meridian. Each plasma pressure observation is plotted versus the XGS M
location of ISEE 2 (panel 2a) and versus the mapped equatorial location X 0 (panel 2b). Mapping procedure is described in the
text. Better ordering of the data is seen in the mapped data.

To eliminate some of the scatter associated with activity levels,
we binned the observations using an effective Kp index. The bin
labeled Kp* = i includes observations made in any three hour
interval for which Kp = i-, i, or i + (see analogy in Tsyganenko
and Usmanov [1982]). For example, Kp* = 1 corresponds to
Kp = 1-, 1, 1+. Eleven subsets (Kp* = 0; 0+; 1-; 1; 1+; 2-;
2; 2+; 3-; 3; 3+; and > 3+) were compiled, ranging from quiet
to disturbed, to investigate how the pressure profiles change with
magnetic activity.

Figure 3 shows pressure values plotted versus X 0 for both low
(Kp* = 1) and moderate (Kp* = 2+) levels of magnetic activ-
ity. The range of pressure at fixed X 0 is somewhat smaller than
in Figure 2b; however, the rms variation of the pressure is not
significantly decreased. Despite the fluctuations it is possible to
observe in both cases that the plasma pressure rises by an order
of magnitude between X 0 = 35 R E and X 0 = 5 R E . In addition,
the pressure magnitude is generally greater for the more active
case, especially at smaller distances.

Some remaining scatter evident in Figure 3 is produced by
unidentified transits into the tail lobes where the pressure is lower
than in the bulk of the data. In addition, scatter can be produced
by variations in the solar wind dynamic pressure (see, for example, Fairfield [1987]). Similar scatter has been evident in previous statistical studies of plasma sheet pressures [Huang and Frank, 1986; Lennartsson and Shelley, 1986] where peak pressures were observed at the center of the plasma sheet where the field minimizes. In this study, we are primarily concerned with central plasma sheet particle pressure, in the region where the plasma sheet magnetic pressure is much less than the lobe magnetic pressure. To extract results for the peak central plasma sheet pressure, the data in each Kp* subset were sorted into 0.5 RE bins in X0 and the median and quartile values of the pressure were determined in each bin. The 0.5 RE bin size was chosen to assure the temporal and spatial independence of the data and is discussed below. We feel that the upper quartile pressure measurements (i.e., peak pressures) give good estimates of the actual near-equatorial plasma pressures.

Figure 4 shows the median and upper and lower quartiles of the binned pressure data for the Kp* = 1− subset and all three traces follow the same trend, decreasing by an order of magnitude between 5 RE and 35 RE. Henceforth, we focus on the upper quartile of the binned ion pressure as most representative of peak central plasma sheet pressure.

In order to estimate the errors in the pressure profiles, we must consider how many independent (both temporally and spatially) estimates are available in each downtail bin. Figure 5 shows the number of observations (or equivalently number of minutes spent) in each X0 bin for the Kp* = 2+ case, a moderate activity level. This distribution is typical. At or near 23 RE, the X0 bins usually contain several hundred data points, while at both smaller and larger X0 the number drops to on the order of 60 averaged observations. It should be noted that the number of independent measurements within an X0 bin is somewhat lower than the number of cases plotted in Figure 5. For measurements to be temporally independent within any particular bin, the bin size (0.5 RE) should be of the same order as the scale length defined by the product of the duration of the observation (60 s) and the velocity along X0. For the measurements to be spatially independent within a bin, the averaging bin size should be greater than or equal to the observation scale length. Therefore to assure both temporal and spatial independence within a bin, the bin size should be nearly the observation scale size.

When the ISEE 2 spacecraft passed through a nearly stationary plasma sheet (as in Figure 1 from 1000 to 1600 UT) the relevant speed is the orbital speed along X0 (~8 km/s at these distances) which yields a size scale of ~0.08 RE, smaller than the 0.5 RE bin size. These observations, while spatially independent, are not temporally independent within a bin. Therefore one orbit could heavily bias the value within a particular bin. This generally occurred on smaller L shells (<12 RE), where the number of independent measurements is roughly 1/6 of the number plotted. Fortunately, more than 80% of the data are from periods when the relevant velocity is that of the plasma sheet rather than the spacecraft. These data are characterized by entries into and exits out of the plasma sheet on relatively short time scales (<15 min) caused by plasma sheet flapping or plasma sheet recovery following a substorm. Plasma sheet motion normal to the equatorial surface

---

Fig. 3. Scatter plots of the plasma sheet pressure versus X0 including data from all ISEE 2 near-midnight observation sorted according to magnetic activity; data from a low (Kp* = 1) and a moderate (Kp* = 2+) level subset are shown.

Fig. 4. The median and upper and lower quartiles of the binned pressure (dynes cm−2) versus X0 (RE) for a magnetically quiet data set (Kp* = 1−). The upper quartile is probably most representative of the plasma pressure near the center of the plasma sheet.
displaces the spacecraft to different field lines, thus changing the effective $X_0$. Using the TU model, we find that, in the near-tail, a vertical displacement of 1 $R_E$ from the center of the plasma sheet corresponds to a change of several $R_E$ in $X_0$. We choose 3 $R_E$ as a representative value of the effective range of $X_0$ sampled in a plasma sheet encounter. If the 15 minutes duration of an encounter is divided equally between entry into and exit out of the plasma sheet, the effective velocity along $X_0$ is $>40$ km/s. Therefore the size scale of the observations is approximately 0.4 $R_E$ in $X_0$, comparable with the 0.5 $R_E$ bin size used in Figures 4 and 5. For this reason, we feel that outside of $\sim 12$ $R_E$ the values shown in Figure 5 approximate the number of both temporally and spatially independent measurements in each bin. Bins with at least 120 samples ($13 < X_0 < 30$) have a probable error of the mean less than 10% of the standard deviation. Beyond this range, the statistical uncertainty is much greater and the curves must be interpreted with caution.

The pressure profiles cannot be corrected for errors inherent to the mapping technique but the nature of the errors so introduced can be described and, to some extent, quantified. We define $Z$ as the distance of the spacecraft from the average position of the neutral sheet in the $Z_{GSM}$ direction. It is well known that processes within the magnetotail (one example being plasma sheet "flapping" [Hones, 1979]) cause the neutral sheet to deviate from its average location. In order to estimate the error in $X_0$ caused by variations in $Z$, we have used the TU model. At fixed $X_{GSM}$ locations, $X_0$ was determined for a range of $Z$ about its nominal value. Variations of 2 $R_E$ in $Z$ (the average departure of the near-tail plasma sheet from its nominal location [Bowling and Wolf, 1974]) were assumed. Over the $\pm 2 R_E$ range in $Z$, $X_0$ varied typically by $<5 R_E$. Variations were largest for the more active models. Fortunately, the effect of mapping errors near apogee are not great because the pressure gradients versus $X_0$ are rather shallow (see Figure 4) at large distances.

The response of near-magnetotail pressure distributions to changing levels of activity is shown in Figure 6. Curves for the upper quartile of data are plotted for $Kp^* = 3^-$ and $1^-$. Both the plasma sheet plasma pressure magnitudes and earthward pressure gradients are larger in the data for more active periods. Between the outer boundary of the analysis and 10 $R_E$, the plasma pressure rises by an order of magnitude for both activity levels with the bulk of the increase occurring inside of about 20 $R_E$. The actual rise in pressure is undoubtedly even greater than shown because the fraction of the energy density contributed by particles whose energy falls above the FPE range increases with decreasing distance. Thus the plotted pressure approximates the actual plasma pressure only in regions where the bulk of the energy density is measured by the FPE detector. We have examined representative FPE ion dynamic differential energy spectra and find that for $X_0$ near 15 $R_E$, ions with energies between a few and $\sim 20$ keV provide the bulk of the energy density. As the spacecraft moves earthward, the peak of the energy density shifts to higher energies as would occur for adiabatic convection. Eventually, the peak of the energy density approaches the uppermost energy channel of the FPE and a substantial fraction of the distribution goes undetected. Thus inside of $\sim 12 R_E$, the pressures in Figure 6 are lower limits, and inward gradients are much steeper.

Beyond about 25 $R_E$, the two distributions are approximately the same in magnitude and appear to be fairly constant with distance. This similarity must be taken with some skepticism because of problems with the model field beyond 25 $R_E$ (discussed earlier) as well as because of the scarcity of data at these distances. In addition, data presented by Baumjohann et al. [1988] suggest that the characteristic plasma energy at a given $X_0$ increases during active times (see also Lennartsson and Shelley [1986] and Huang and Frank [1986]). Therefore it is possible that the flux at energies above the highest energy channel of the FPE is significant much farther down the tail during intervals of high $Kp$. Evidently, this...
When the tail approximation (equation (3)) applies, it can be shown that the magnetic pressure in the adjacent tail lobes is balanced by magnetic tension $\left(\frac{B^2}{8\pi}\right)$ in the limit of ideal MHD, where we assume an isotropic plasma. However, gradients in the total plasma and magnetic pressure are at least ten times greater than the magnetic tension.

The curves of Figure 6 contain direct information of the time-averaged plasma pressure in the plasma sheet, and indirect information of the magnetic pressure in the adjacent tail lobes. In the limit of ideal MHD, where we assume an isotropic plasma, equation (1) can be written in the form

$$\nabla \left( P + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right) = \frac{1}{4\pi} (B \cdot \nabla)B$$

(2)

where gradients in the total plasma and magnetic pressure are balanced by magnetic tension $\left(\frac{1}{4\pi} (B \cdot \nabla)B\right)$. The two-dimensional tail approximation is characterized by the ordering scheme (for a more complete discussion see Schindler and Birn [1986])

$$B_x, \frac{\partial}{\partial z} = O(1) \quad B_y, B_z, \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = O(\epsilon)$$

(3)

When the tail approximation (equation (3)) applies, it can be shown that through $O(\epsilon)$ the $z$ component of equation (2) reduces to

$$\nabla \left( P + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right) = 0$$

(4)

In the tail lobes, the magnetic pressure is much greater than the plasma pressure and at the center of the plasma sheet, the plasma pressure dominates the magnetic pressure (see, Fairfield et al. [1981] and Fairfield [1987]). Therefore integration of equation (4) in the $z$ direction yields the approximate requirement that

$$P_{ps} = B_{\perp}^2/(8\pi)$$

(5)

where $P_{ps}$ is the central plasma sheet plasma pressure and $B_{\perp}$ is the asymptotic lobe magnetic field strength. Regions in which equation (5) applies, are those where $\nabla(b^2/(8\pi)) \gg \frac{1}{4\pi} (B \cdot \nabla)B$ and we use the TU models to test the inequality. We determined that equation (5) is valid for $X_0$ greater than $\sim 15 \text{ RE}$, where gradients of the magnetic pressure are at least ten times greater than the magnetic tension.

The average lobe magnetic field as a function of $X_0$ is known from the work of Mihalov et al. [1968] and Behannon [1968]. Their fits to hourly averaged Explorer 33 data were used to obtain two curves of the lobe magnetic pressure superimposed on Figure 6; curves are plotted only for $X_0 > 15 \text{ RE}$ where equation (5) applies. The study by Mihalov et al. included data from slightly higher magnetic activities ($K_p < 2^+$) than did the Behannon work ($K_p < 2$). The curves representing the lobe magnetic and plasma sheet plasma pressures follow each other reasonably closely in to $15 \text{ RE}$. Inside of $\sim 15 \text{ RE}$, the balance of magnetic and thermal pressures must be described by equation (2) rather than equation (5). In fact, if the pressure is anisotropic, the relevant balance is expressed by equation (1). Solutions of the latter type, obtained by Spence et al. [1986], are discussed in a following section.

In our discussion of Figure 6 we noted that the plasma pressures are underestimated by FPE measurements inside of $\sim 12 \text{ RE}$. Consequently, we turn to other data to supplement FPE measurements inside of $12 \text{ RE}$. The three sources of supplementary data, listed in order of increasing apogee distance, are the Explorer 45 ($S^3A$) satellite, the ATS 5 satellite, and the AMPTE CCE satellite.

### 2.2. Explorer 45 ($S^3A$) Plasma Experiment

The Small Scientific Satellite ($S^3A$), Explorer 45, was launched into an elliptical, equatorial orbit with its apogee at $5.24 \text{ RE}$. Particle measurements were made with channel multiplier detector systems and solid state detectors which measured ions with energies between 800 eV and >3.8 MeV. Smith and Hoffman [1973] used these data to characterize the proton pressure in the equatorial magnetosphere for $L$ shells interior to $5.5 \text{ RE}$. Smith and Hoffman analyzed ion measurements in the $1$–$872 \text{ keV}$ range obtained on December 16–18, 1971, when apogee was near 2100 hours magnetic local time. They presented data from several orbits spanning a wide range of magnetic activities. From their published results, the ion pressure as a function of radial distance and level of magnetic disturbance along the midnight meridian may be roughly estimated. We restrict our attention to intervals when the spacecraft was near apogee and was within $\sim 3$ hours of midnight. We justify the assumed independence of local time by appeal to the work of DeForest and McIlwain [1971] who showed that for ions, with energies between $50 \text{ eV}$ and $50 \text{ keV}$ at geostationary orbit, the typical observed pressure varied by only about 10% between $2100 \text{ LT}$ and $0000 \text{ LT}$.

Table 1 tabulates pressures from Smith and Hoffman [1973] for three orbits representing quiet (prolonged geomagnetically quiescent conditions), moderate (growth phase of an isolated substorm), and disturbed (recovery phase of a large storm) conditions. Data were taken in $0.5 \text{ RE}$ radial bins, for each of the three activity levels. The second through fourth columns contain pressures determined over energies of $1$ to $872 \text{ keV}$, pressures determined with the lowest energy channel ($1$ to $24 \text{ keV}$) during moderate conditions are listed in the last column. Between $5.5$ and $3.5 \text{ RE}$, the pressure increases by a factor of 2 to 3, with a peak between $3.5$ and $4.5 \text{ RE}$. Interior to about $3.5 \text{ RE}$ the pressure declines rapidly. At $2.5 \text{ RE}$, the pressure has fallen below its value at $5.5 \text{ RE}$. The observed pressure is a strong function of substorm.

### Table 1. Explorer 45 Proton Pressure (dynes cm$^{-2}$) for $2100 < LT < 2400$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$L_0$</th>
<th>Quiet (1–$872 \text{ keV}$)</th>
<th>Moderate (1–$872 \text{ keV}$)</th>
<th>Disturbed (1–$872 \text{ keV}$)</th>
<th>Moderate (1–$24 \text{ keV}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$2.7 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$4.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$4.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$7.3 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$8.0 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$2.3 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$8.0 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$2.3 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$2.3 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$9.3 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$1.9 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$6.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$6.7 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$9.3 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$1.4 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>$4.3 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$5.7 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$6.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$8.0 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$5.3 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Smith and Hoffman [1973].
activity. In each radial bin of Table 1, the pressure increases by about a factor of 2 between the quietest and the most active period.

Table 1 confirms that at ~5 \( R_E \) the FPE measurements underestimate the total pressure by at least an order of magnitude for both the quiet and the more active data sets. Within the range of energies measured by both FPE and the Explorer 45 detector, the partial pressures are consistent with each other. In particular, pressures derived from the Explorer 45 1-24 keV energy channel (see Table 1, column 5) may be compared with pressures obtained from the FPE (70 eV to 40 keV). During moderate activity at 5 \( R_E \), the FPE yielded pressures of \( \sim 8 \times 10^{-9} \) dynes/cm\(^2\) whereas the lowest energy Explorer 45 partial pressures were 6 \( \times 10^{-9} \) dynes/cm\(^2\); the difference can be attributed to the FPEs slightly broader energy coverage. The Smith and Hoffman data show that at ~5 \( R_E \) the fraction of the pressure carried by the 1 to 24 keV ions is relatively small (<10% to ~30% of the total). Therefore while the FPE pressures are probably quite reasonable beyond about 12 \( R_E \), they are too low by ~70% to >90% in the inner regions (~5 \( R_E \)).

The data require that very steep pressure gradients must exist in the "transition" zone linking the relatively low pressure region beyond 12 \( R_E \) with the high pressure region at distances less than ~5 \( R_E \).

### 2.3. ATS 5 UCSD Plasma Experiment

Further insight into the near-tail pressure gradient can be gained using plasma data obtained from geostationary spacecraft. The average plasma pressure at ~6.6 \( R_E \) was characterized by DeForest and Mcllwain [1971] using data from the ATS 5 University of California at San Diego (UCSD) plasma experiment. Protons and electrons with energies ranging from 50 eV to 50 keV were detected.

DeForest and Mcllwain found that although the structure of the energy spectra was rather variable, the integrals of the spectra at any given magnetic local time were much more stable. For 29 days in January 1970, they determined the minimum, maximum, and typical values of the plasma pressure in six different local time bins. The results for ion pressure in the three near-midnight local time bins from Table 1 of their paper are reproduced here in Table 2. The bins are centered at the noted times. Pressures tabulated in Table 2 vary by roughly 75% with activity. Peak pressures occur in the midnight local time bin except for the most active times when the peak moves dustward. For quiet and typical periods, the average pressures vary very little (<20%) within six hours centered about midnight.

Comparison of the ATS 5 pressures with the Explorer 45 data suggests that the pressure decreases by a factor of 7 to 8 between 5.5 and 6.6 \( R_E \). However, as DeForest and Mcllwain [1971] point out, pressures determined from the ATS 5 plasma data are lower limits as the moments were taken only over the range of 50 eV to 50 keV. This means that the combined data of Tables 1 and 2 may overestimate the steepness of the inward pressure gradient inside of geostationary orbit.

### 2.4. AMPTE CCE Plasma Experiments

In recent years, great progress has been made in determining both the energy distribution and composition of particles in the inner magnetosphere with measurements from particle detectors on the charge composition explorer (CCE) of the active magnetospheric particle tracer explorers (AMPTE) mission. CCE's epoxy is 8.8 \( R_E \) and therefore provides data in the regions surrounding geostationary orbit where systematic studies have been wanting. Unfortunately, there have been no published results of pressures near midnight. However, with appropriate assumptions and some measure of caution, observations at other local times can be used to infer plasma pressures near midnight. Below, we summarize the available observations away from midnight and then describe how they were mapped to the midnight meridian.

Studies of the evolution of the ring current plasma during the September 4-7, 1984, magnetic storms have used the medium energy particle analyzer (MEPA) [see McEntire et al., 1985, and Lui et al., 1987]. Data were obtained by an ion head on the MEPA which provided total energy measurements for ions with energies between ~25 keV and 1 MeV. Pressure moments in both studies were calculated assuming that all detected ions were protons. Data were obtained on an inbound pass between ~8.5 \( R_E \) (1500 LT) and ~2.5 \( R_E \) (1700 LT). In the Lui et al. [1987] study, both magnetically quiet and disturbed pressure profiles were determined. The quiet profiles were obtained during periods of reasonably small \( Dst \) (<100 nT). Representative examples of the disturbed (solid curve) and quiet (dashed curve) pressure profiles are reproduced from Lui et al. [1987] in Figure 7. As before, the pressure reaches a maximum of almost 2 \( \times 10^{-7} \) dynes/cm\(^2\) at ~3-4 \( R_E \). Generally, during more disturbed periods the pressure is roughly double that of quiet periods.

To make use of the Lui et al. results for local times between 1500 and 1700 LT for this investigation of pressure profiles near midnight, we mapped the measured fluxes to local midnight along constant B contours. To find out if the constant B mapping is a good assumption, we considered how drift paths would change in the available observations away from midnight and then describe how they were mapped to the midnight meridian.

### Table 2. ATS 5 Proton Pressure (50 eV to 50 keV) at Geosynchronous Orbit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Time, hours</th>
<th>Minimum Pressure, ( \times 10^{-9} ) dynes cm(^{-2})</th>
<th>Typical Pressure, ( \times 10^{-8} ) dynes cm(^{-2})</th>
<th>Maximum Pressure, ( \times 10^{-8} ) dynes cm(^{-2})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From DeForest and Mcllwain [1971].
reduce the pressure. This means that interior to synchronous orbit, realistic drift orbits carry particles toward larger $B$ at midnight and reduce the pressure. For instance, for mapping yields a lower limit on the pressure.

The 25 keV protons near the spacecraft apogee of 8.5 $R_E$.

A dipole field, the deviation from constancy approaches 20% for the 25 keV protons near the spacecraft apogee of 8.5 $R_E$. Realistic drift orbits carry particles toward larger $B$ at midnight and reduce the pressure. This means that interior to synchronous orbit the mapping is probably quite good while at greater distances the mapping yields a lower limit on the pressure.

3. PRESSURE PROFILES IN THE MIDNIGHT MERIDIAN BETWEEN 2.5 AND 35 $R_E$

In Figure 8 we provide plots of the plasma measurements discussed above. The Lui et al. [1987] AMPTE CCE observations have been mapped to the midnight meridian by using the TU models and the assumption $B = \text{constant}$. Both the quiet and active pressure profiles are included. As the TU field is realistically compressed on the dayside and stretched on the nightside, constant $|B|$ contours move earthward between local afternoon and midnight. The effect is to shift near-apogee (8.5 $R_E$) AMPTE CCE measurements at $\sim 1600$ LT, to $\sim 7$ $R_E$ on the midnight meridian. The tabulated pressures derived from Explorer 45 (in Table 1) and ATS 5 (in Table 2), as well as the ISEE 2 FPE pressures (from Figure 6), are also shown. For distances less than 12 $R_E$, the FPE provides only lower limits to the plasma pressure, so the curves of Figure 6 have been terminated at 12 $R_E$.

Figure 8 provides our best estimate of the peak plasma pressure profile in the midnight meridian of the magnetotail. For $X_0 > 12$ $R_E$, the ISEE 2 FPE samples enough of the ion distribution function to yield representative plasma pressures for quiet and perhaps, more disturbed conditions. In the inner magnetosphere (2.5 < $X_0$ < 5.5 $R_E$), the Explorer 45 measurements are quite reliable. The plotted points represent the typical (moderately active) observed pressures; bars range from the maximum (disturbed) to the minimum (quiet) reported values. The AMPTE CCE measurements between 2.5 and 4 $R_E$ are consistent with the Explorer 45 measurements for both quiet and disturbed conditions. As the two instruments sample different ranges of energy, the agreement suggests that the characteristic energy in this spatial range is above 25 keV. Williams [1980] found that for 3.6 < $L$ < 4.2, 50% of the integral ring current pressure resided in the >85 keV protons, consistent with the above arguments. Between 4 and 5.5 $R_E$, the AMPTE CCE pressures fall below the Explorer 45 values by roughly a factor of 2. We infer that much of the plasma pressure in this region is carried by particles whose energy is near the 25 keV threshold of the CCE detector. Measurements made at synchronous orbit by the ATS 5 UCSD experiment are comparable to the AMPTE CCE observations at the same distance. Because the ATS 5 experiment sampled much lower energies than AMPTE CCE, particles with energies less than $\sim 25$ keV must not contribute significantly to the pressure at synchronous orbit. Outside of synchronous orbit, CCE probably provides a lower bound to the total pressure as the peak of the pressure moves to lower energies.

4. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The profile of particle pressure along the midnight meridian at quiet and disturbed times has been obtained by using measurements from many spacecraft. The pressure changes are relatively gentle except in a region between 5 and 12 $R_E$ where data coverage is incomplete. We refer to this region as the "transition" region.

Previous discussion of the distribution of currents and plasma in the transition region should be noted. Spence et al. [1987] inferred the distribution of plasma in the near-magnetotail by assuming magnetohydrostatic equilibrium within the TU magneto- spheric magnetic field models. The region in which the model field was applicable was nearly coincident with the "transition" region ($6.5 < L < 12$). In Figure 8, we have superimposed the Spence et al. $K_p = 0$ and $K_p > 3^+$ solutions. The model-derived
pressures bridge the gap between observations on either side of the transition zone in a reasonable way; both the magnitude of the inferred pressure and the pressure gradient agree quantitatively with the data. The agreement is especially good inside of 10 $R_E$ where the solutions have smaller errors. Typically, the model solutions satisfy the magnetostatic condition to within ~10%. These small errors are probably responsible for the unconvincing second derivative of the model-derived pressure profiles (particularly beyond 10 $R_E$). We emphasize that the solutions obtained from the higher $K_p$ models have larger associated errors than do the less active models. Not only is the model field less representative of an actual instantaneous field configuration, but also during more active intervals the magnetotail is less likely to be well-described by equation (1). In a future paper, we will more thoroughly compare the inferred pressures from the less active models with the data presented herein.

The plasma pressures obtained in the present paper may serve as a guide for equilibrium tail models such as those developed by Birn [1987]. The Birn model requires both equatorial field and plasma pressure profiles in the near tail which serve as boundary conditions to the full 3D equilibrium solution. Knowledge of plasma pressure data may also be useful in studies of wave properties in the inner magnetosphere. Moore et al. [1987] used empirical models of field and plasma characteristics to deduce the variations of the Alfvén and fast mode wave speed in the magnetosphere. By combining empirical number densities with the pressures deduced in the present paper, the "effective" temperature required by Moore et al. could be better constrained.

Our study of plasma pressure reveals that a significant portion of the transition region between geostationary orbit and 12 $R_E$ near midnight is not well constrained by direct observation. At the inner edge of the transition region (synchronous orbit), comparison of pressures obtained by spacecraft with different energy ranges indicates that ions with energies less than ~25 keV do not contribute significantly to the pressure. It is clear that the pressure must fall by about an order of magnitude in the transition region in order to be consistent with both Explorer 45 at 5.5 $R_E$ and ISEE 2 observations near the subsolar magnetopause, $Space Sci. Rev.$, 22, 717, 1978.
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