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[1] There is still much to be understood about the processes contributing to relativistic electron enhancements and losses in the radiation belts. Wave particle interactions with both whistler and electromagnetic ion cyclotron (EMIC) waves may precipitate or accelerate these electrons. This study examines the relation between EMIC waves and resulting relativistic electron flux levels after geomagnetic storms. A proxy for enhanced EMIC waves is developed using Los Alamos National Laboratory Magnetospheric Plasma Analyzer data from geosynchronous orbit in conjunction with linear theory. In a statistical study using superposed epoch analysis, it is found that for storms resulting in net relativistic electron losses, there is a greater occurrence of enhanced EMIC waves. This is consistent with the hypothesis that EMIC waves are a primary mechanism for the scattering of relativistic electrons and thus cause losses of such particles from the magnetosphere.
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1. Introduction

[2] The Earth’s radiation belts are highly variable, and the processes contributing to their enhancement and reduction are an area of active research. High relativistic electron flux levels are found following some geomagnetic storms but not others. The resultant flux does not seem to be correlated to the size of the storm or the prestorm flux level [Reeves et al., 2003]. Both acceleration and loss processes contribute to determining the poststorm populations, with wave-particle interactions believed to play an important role in these processes. MacDonald et al. [2008] examined whistler waves using a proxy based on the electron population and a superposed epoch analysis to find that storms resulting in higher radiation belt fluxes had higher levels of whistler waves. Their analysis agreed well with a similar superposed epoch analysis of whistler wave distributions using ground-based magnetometers [Smith et al., 2004]. In this paper, we focus on electromagnetic ion cyclotron (EMIC) waves, which are often produced by the Alfven cyclotron instability driven by the anisotropy of hot plasma sheet ions [e.g., Anderson et al., 1996] and can resonate with relativistic electrons to cause pitch angle scattering and thus losses to the atmosphere [Albert, 2003; Summers and Thorne, 2003].

[3] EMIC waves have long been observed in space and from the ground. In general, they have been found to be most prevalent in the dusk or afternoon sector [Fraser and Nguyen, 2001]. Ground observations of Pc1-Pc2 waves have indicated consistent local-time distribution; however, differences (possibly due to ionospheric attenuation) appear when comparing by storm phase; in particular, a distinct lack of these waves is observed during the storm main phase [Engebretson et al., 2008]. This contrasts with most in situ observations, including early work by Bossen et al. [1976], which observed an increase in afternoon sector Pc1 events at geosynchronous orbit, believed to indicate EMIC waves, coinciding with the main phase of geomagnetic storms. Observational evidence for the scattering and loss of relativistic electrons by EMIC waves has been reviewed by Millan and Thorne [2007]. Spasojevic et al. [2004] used multiple IMAGE observations to show the first direct link between a detached subauroral proton arc and a plasmaspheric plume and that instability growth calculations were consistent with the Alfven cyclotron instability causing EMIC waves and proton precipitation within the plume region.

[4] In this paper we do not use direct observations of EMIC waves. Rather, we infer the existence of the waves from the observed properties of the hot plasma population using statistical analysis and linear theory, described in section 2. We develop a proxy for enhanced EMIC waves on the basis of in situ plasma parameters measured at geosynchronous orbit, and we explore the inferred occurrence of such waves relative to relativistic electron flux levels during and after geomagnetic storms.

2. Linear Theory

[5] Observations, theory, and simulations have established the following general picture for the interaction of anisotropic ion velocity distributions and enhanced EMIC fluctuations in space plasmas. Consider an idealized electron-proton collisionless plasma in which both species are represented by
bi-Maxwellian velocity distributions. Consider the condition \( T_{ip}/T_{ip} > 1 \), where the directional subscripts represent directions relative to the background magnetic field and \( p \) denotes protons. If this anisotropy is sufficiently large, it will excite growth of the electromagnetic proton cyclotron anisotropy instability [Gary, 1993]. The resulting enhanced EMIC fluctuations have maximum growth at \( k \times B_0 = 0 \), where \( B_0 \) is the background magnetic field and \( k \) is the wave vector, with a range of frequencies \( 0 < \omega < \Omega_p \), where the latter symbol represents the proton cyclotron frequency. The fluctuations from this instability are further characterized by left-hand polarization and weak magnetic compressibility.

The enhanced fluctuations are resonant with and scatter the protons so as to reduce \( T_{ip}/T_{ip} \) and thereby quench the instability. As a result an upper bound is imposed upon the proton anisotropy, which can be written as

\[
\frac{T_{ip}}{T_{ip}} = 1 - \frac{S_p}{\beta_{ip}^2},
\]

where \( \beta_{ip} = 8\pi n_p T_{ip}/B_0^2 \) and \( S_p \) and \( \alpha_p \) are parameters which are obtained by a fit to the instability threshold condition derived from linear theory. For example, choosing the maximum growth rate to be \( \gamma_m/\Omega_p = 10^{-3} \) yields \( S_p = 0.43 \) and \( \alpha_p = 0.42 \) for a fit over the range 0.01 \( \leq \beta_{ip} \leq 10 \) [Gary et al., 1994].

In the terrestrial magnetosphere, observations show the existence of two or more distinct components in ion velocity distributions. Consider the idealized picture of two proton components, one hot (\( h \)) and one cool (\( c \)). In the plasmasphere, \( n_c \gg n_h \) and \( T_{ih} \gg T_{ic} \); the cool component is relatively dense and collisional so that it is relatively isotropic. Beyond the plasmasphere, the cool component persists but at densities such that \( n_c \sim n_h \). The presence of the cool component modifies the properties of the proton cyclotron instability so that the upper bound on the anisotropy is written as

\[
\frac{T_{ih}}{T_{ih}} = 1 - \frac{S_h}{\beta_{ih}^2},
\]

where \( \beta_{ih} = 8\pi n_h T_{ih}/B_0^2 \) and \( S_h \) and \( \alpha_h \) are fitting parameters which are functions of both \( T_{ih}/\Omega_p \) and \( n_h/n_c \), where \( n_c \) is the electron density, which we take to be equal to \( n_h + n_c \) [Gary et al., 1994]. Equation (2) has the same form as (1), namely that of a limiting anisotropy, though the limit to the instability now has a more complex description. If we choose a fixed value of the maximum growth rate, we can then use linear theory to determine how these two fitting parameters vary with the relative hot proton density. Linear theory shows that both parameters are relatively weak functions of \( n_h/n_c \). We have quantified this result by choosing the forms

\[
S_h = \sigma_0 + \sigma_1 \ln(n_h/n_c) + \sigma_2 [\ln(n_h/n_c)]^2
\]

and

\[
\alpha_h = a_0 - a_1 \ln(n_h/n_c) - a_2 [\ln(n_h/n_c)]^2.
\]


Then, assuming \( \gamma_m/\Omega_p = 10^{-3} \), we fit linear theory results to these two curves, obtaining \( \sigma_0 = 0.429, \sigma_1 = 0.124, \sigma_2 = 0.0118, a_0 = 0.409, a_1 = 0.0145, \) and \( a_2 = 0.00028 \).

The most direct determination of EMIC wave activity in space plasmas is through the use of spacecraft magnetometers, which measure the level of magnetic fluctuations near and below the proton cyclotron frequency. However, the plasma data described in section 3 are obtained from spacecraft that do not carry magnetometers; thus, we have developed a procedure, similar to MacDonald et al. [2008] for whistler waves, whereby theory and plasma observations become a proxy for direct measurements of wave activity. In this study, we use Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) Magnetospheric Plasma Analyzer (MPA) particle data to develop the proxy for enhanced EMIC wave activity, \( \Sigma_{hi} \), from equation (4). We look at data from seven satellites at geosynchronous orbit from years 1989–2004. We calculate bulk moments, including density and perpendicular and parallel temperature for both the hot proton population, defined as 100 eV to 45 keV, and the cool protons, less than 100 eV. Here perpendicular and parallel are in reference to the background magnetic field vector, as inferred from symmetry in the plasma distributions [Thomsen et al., 1999]. The ion population is assumed to be only protons as the MPA instrument does not distinguish among the various ion species. While magnetospheric conditions can be quite far from this ideal, the presence of heavy ions should not greatly affect our calculations. Cold He\(^+\) can at times constitute a significant fraction of the cold magnetospheric ions, but it does not contribute substantially to driving the instability. Although helium cyclotron damping creates a stop band in the spectrum near the helium cyclotron frequency, the maximum growth rate is only modestly reduced [Gendrin et al., 1984; Kozyra et al., 1984]. Hot magnetospheric O\(^+\) can also be present during magnetic storms. Such ions can be anisotropic and can contribute to instability growth, but the resonant frequencies of such waves are near 1/16 \( \Omega_p \) and
therefore resonate with electrons of energies a few times higher than the MeV ones of primary geophysical interest [Meredith et al., 2003].}

[11] From these data, we use a superposed epoch technique to examine over 300 storms, chosen following criteria first described by O’Brien et al. [2001, 2003] and subsequently used by Smith et al. [2004] and MacDonald et al. [2008]. Storms were superposed by setting the time of minimum $Dst$ equal to zero epoch. The storms were chosen to be isolated, not within 4 days of another storm’s minimum $Dst$, and to have a minimum $Dst$ of less than $-50$ nT. The storm list is divided into two categories, events and nonevents, on the basis of poststorm relativistic electron flux levels measured by LANL satellites at geosynchronous orbit. Storms whose noon-reconstructed 1.8–3.5 MeV electron flux was above 0.5 $e$/cm$^2$ s sr keV for 48–72 h after $Dst$ minimum were categorized as events, and those with fluxes lower than 0.5 were categorized as nonevents. (The so-called noon reconstruction technique is described by O’Brien et al. [2001].) These criteria, based only on the poststorm flux, were chosen because the prestorm flux has been shown to be uncorrelated with the poststorm result [Reeves et al., 2003].

[12] Figure 1 shows superposed $Dst$ and $Kp$ plots for both the 138 storms constituting the events list, having higher poststorm flux levels, and the 183 storms of the nonevents, having lower levels. The $Dst$ profiles for the two groups of storms look fairly similar, while the $Kp$ for events stays elevated, above a level of 3, for approximately 1 day longer than nonevents. This suggests that the events storms have extended driving, similar to corotating interaction region (CIR) occurrences examined using superposed epoch analysis by Miyoshi and Kataoka [2005] and Denton et al. [2006].

[13] With this data set, we compare relevant properties of the geosynchronous proton population for the events and nonevents storm lists. We examine the effect of these parameters on the enhanced EMIC wave proxy for the two sets of storms, globally and as a function of storm phase, or epoch time.

4. Results

[14] We perform an observational test of the linear theory proxy formulation discussed in section 2, and we compare the theoretical instability threshold $S_h$ to our observational EMIC growth parameter $S_h$. The solid lines in Figure 2 show $S_h$ as a function of the ratio of the hot proton density to the total density $n_h/n_e$ for three different growth rates, $\gamma_m/\Omega_p = 0.001, 0.004$, and 0.01. The scatter points show $S_h$ for the nonevents storm set for two different local times, at noon and at midnight. Both events and nonevents storm sets show similar qualitative behavior when plotted in this manner. Here, data points with increasing $S_h$ values relative to an $S_h$ curve correspond to the transition from stable conditions to successively stronger growth rates. $S_h$ approaches a theoretical limit (e.g., $\gamma_m/\Omega_p = 0.01$ for the noon points) indicating that enhanced fluctuations from the EMIC instability are effectively scattering protons near this threshold condition and are imposing a statistical constraint on the proton temperature anisotropy. Figure 2 validates the use of the observed $S_h$ compared to the theoretical limit of $S_h$ as a proxy for enhanced EMIC waves. Additionally, it tells us that a growth rate of 0.001 is appropriate for data points at midnight, while a higher value of 0.01 is approached during local times around noon.

[15] We plot various parameters over local and epoch times to better understand the variations of constituent plasma properties for our events and nonevents storm sets. We begin by looking at the different density components of the proton population, the hot and cool, as well as the ratio of the hot to total proton density $n_h/n_e$ (Figures 3a, 3c, and 3e for events and Figures 3b, 3d, and 3f for nonevents). Figures 3a and 3b show the hot plasma sheet density, highest around minimum $Dst$ from dusk through dawn, extending further both in local and epoch time for the nonevents storms, as seen by Denton et al. [2006]. In Figures 3c and 3d, there is evidence of cold dense plasmaspheric plumes in the afternoon sector during storm main phase (prior to minimum $Dst$) and continuing, with a weaker presence and narrower in local time, through the recovery phase in both sets of storms. The density ratio (Figures 3e and 3f) is a variable when calculating $S_h$ that affects the value of the instability threshold for a given growth rate (see Figure 2). Over most of the range of $n_h/n_e$, a lower ratio (corresponding to more cool plasma) lowers the instability threshold, and enhanced EMIC waves can more easily be obtained. Both Figures 3e and 3f show that the plasma sampled at geosynchronous orbit is dominated by hot
plasma in the midnight sector throughout the duration of the storms and that very low levels of hot protons exist on the day side. Starting just prior to 1 day after minimum \( Dst \), the density ratio is lower for the nonevents than events in the region around midnight.

We also explore the temperature anisotropy of the hot protons for both storm lists (Figures 4a and 4b), as it is the temperature anisotropy in this population that drives the Alfvén cyclotron instability responsible for the growth of EMIC mode waves. Here a difference between the events and nonevents storm sets, as well as a great deal of variation over local time. Nonevents have a higher value, especially around noon, but additionally around dawn in the recovery phase. The absolute value of this parameter alone, though, is not necessarily indicative of higher wave growth, but must be compared with the expected \( S_h \) at given local and epoch times to be able to infer relative wave growth.

To make this comparison, we calculate the percent of \( S_h \) data points that exceed the average \( S_h \) for each local and epoch time bin. Figure 6 shows the percentage of time that the observational EMIC growth parameter \( S_h \) (Figures 5c and 5d), however, shows a significant difference between the events and nonevents storm sets, as well as a great deal of variation over local time. Nonevents have a higher value, especially around noon, but additionally around dawn in the recovery phase. The absolute value of this parameter alone, though, is not necessarily indicative of higher wave growth, but must be compared with the expected \( S_h \) at given local and epoch times to be able to infer relative wave growth.

5. Discussion

Figure 7 shows the epoch time dependence of this percentage averaged from noon to dusk, the region of most interest. Here gray indicates nonevents, black indicates events, and the thin solid line shows the quiet time average of both storm sets (from 6 to 10 days after storm epoch), with dotted lines showing the standard deviation averaged for both storm sets. The events storms, which result in elevated relativistic flux levels 48 to 72 h after minimum \( Dst \), show different \( S_h \) behavior than the nonevents especially 1 to 4 days after zero epoch, during the recovery phase of the storms. Both types of storms appear to have higher occurrence of enhanced EMIC waves, according to our proxy, in the main phase of the storm, which is consistent with in situ wave measurements seen by B. J. Fraser et al. (Stormtime observations of electromagnetic ion cyclotron waves at geosynchronous orbit: GOES results, submitted to Journal of Geophysical Research, 2009). They then both display a sharp drop in this measurement immediately after zero epoch, minimum \( Dst \). In the subsequent days, however, the non-events recover to levels around 8% (an average quiet time value), while the events remain at around 3%. The quiet time value for both storm sets fluctuates, with an average value around 7.5%. This suggests that the difference in events and nonevents in the recovery phase of storms is associated with a suppression of EMIC growth in the events, rather than an enhancement in the nonevents. One possible explanation for this is that CIR storms, which show similar properties to our
Figure 3.  (a and b) Hot proton density $n_h$, (c and d) cold proton density $n_c$, and (e and f) density ratio $n_h/n_c$ plots across all local and epoch times for events and nonevents. Density ratio $n_h/n_c$ is lowest in the region from approximately noon to dusk, where the cold dense plume is located.
events storms, involve enhanced convection and elevated $K_p$. Denton et al. [2005] show that temperature anisotropy is typically inversely related to $K_p$ index. As temperature anisotropy is a main component of our calculation of the EMIC growth parameter, a lower anisotropy could lead to suppressed $S_h$ values. As $K_p$ remains elevated during the recovery period of our events storms, as seen in Figure 1, less anisotropic plasma is present during this period, leading to the suppression of EMIC growth seen in our events storms.

[22] We return to Figure 6 to examine the percentage values over all local and epoch times. The most concentrated area of enhanced EMIC fluctuations is shown to be in the region from noon to dusk. This is in agreement with in situ EMIC wave observations, as shown by both Meredith et al. [2003] and Bossen et al. [1976]. The distribution of elevated values in these final percentage plots (Figure 6) differs significantly from those for the observational EMIC growth parameter $S_h$ alone in Figures 5c and 5d. This emphasizes the need to compare the observed $S_h$ to the theoretical instability threshold determined by $S_h$. While the temperature anisotropy and hot plasma beta parameters cause elevated values from dawn nearly to dusk in our nonevents, the density ratio causes the instability threshold to be more easily attained only from noon to dusk, where more cold plasma is present. Therefore, we conclude that the Alfvén cyclotron instability can grow, and enhanced EMIC waves can arise, most easily from noon to dusk, showing that our proxy for such waves corresponds in local time to wave observations.

6. Summary

[23] In conclusion, we have used plasma measurements from MPA instruments at geosynchronous orbit to show that the linear threshold of the Alfvén cyclotron instability is approached at certain local times. This, combined with the local time agreement seen in Figure 6, supports our examination of EMIC wave presence and distributions using plasma measurements from MPA at geosynchronous orbit. This result enables broader understanding of the powerful applications of using plasma data to infer wave distributions in space.

[24] We observe that there are differences in the statistical behavior of certain relevant plasma properties between storms resulting in higher versus lower net fluxes of relativ-
The percentage of $S_h$ values which lie above the average $S_h$ value for a given local and epoch time. For both (a) events and (b) nonevents, this percentage is high from noon to dusk during the main phase of the storm. In the recovery phase, however, there is a significant difference between the two storm sets, and the values for the nonevents are higher than events for a few days after minimum $Dst$.

Figure 5. (a and b) Theoretical instability threshold $S_h$, dependent on the density ratio $n_h/n_e$ only, and (c and d) EMIC growth parameter $\Sigma_h$, based on measured plasma parameters. Both are plotted for all local and epoch times for a growth rate $\gamma_m/\Omega_p = 0.001$.

Figure 6. The percentage of $\Sigma_h$ values which lie above the average $S_h$ value for a given local and epoch time. For both (a) events and (b) nonevents, this percentage is high from noon to dusk during the main phase of the storm. In the recovery phase, however, there is a significant difference between the two storm sets, and the values for the nonevents are higher than events for a few days after minimum $Dst$. 
istic electrons. From these plasma parameters and validated linear theory, we find that both the average values of our observational EMIC growth parameter $\Sigma_{th}$, as well as the frequency of elevated values, are greater, especially in the recovery phase of the storm, for storms resulting in lower radiation belt fluxes, labeled nonevents. Our study reveals that the percent of time that EMIC wave growth exceeds a rate of $\gamma_m/\Omega_p = 0.001$ is greater for our nonevents, which result in lower relativistic electron flux levels after storms. This is consistent with the idea that enhanced EMIC waves scatter relativistic electrons and thereby contribute to the loss of such particles from the magnetosphere in the main phase, and for nonevents on into the recovery phase, preventing the buildup of substantial poststorm flux enhancements.
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