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Abstract. A survey, using results from the first 25 orbits of ISEE-1, has been made of some aspects of electrons in the dawn magnetosheath. There are indications that the flow of plasma is not uniformly turbulent over this region. The electron heat flux is observed to be directed away from the shock and to have an average value of about twice the interplanetary heat flux. Many magnetopause crossings were observed and usually resemble abrupt transitions from one well-defined plasma state to another. The ejection of plasma from flux tubes convected up against the magnetopause is observed for about half the time, and its thickness and dependence on the solar wind mach number agree with theoretical predictions. A full traversal of the whole forward hemisphere of the magnetosheath is required to fully confirm these deductions.

1. Introduction

In this paper the aim is to illustrate the capabilities and operation of this instrument and the data reduction system by conducting a preliminary partial survey of the magnetosheath using appropriate data obtained during the first 25 orbits of ISEE-1. This survey, which is confined to the region of the sheath between the subsolar point and the dawn meridian, will be concerned with observations of the electron distribution functions, and the flow of heat, and also the behavior of the plasma density in the region adjacent to the magnetopause. Examples of magnetopause crossings will be given, and the discussion of this data set indicates that the picture of a magnetosheath unstable to the mirror instability, with large amplitude disturbances, and bounded by a magnetopause whose surface carries wave-like disturbances is generally applicable. The reductions of density adjacent to the magnetopause are found to be consistent with the theory of Zwan and Wolf (1976), and result from the expulsion of plasma from flux tubes as these are convected up to the magnetopause. Such reductions occur in at least half of the traversals and seem to depend weakly if at all upon the angle between the interplanetary magnetic field and the solar wind flow direction.

2. The Instrument

The instrument forms the subject of a separate paper (Ogilvie et al., 1978); we therefore give only a very condensed description here. In order to determine the distribution function of electrons in three dimensions, it measures the electron spectrum along both senses of three perpendicular directions fixed in the coordinate system of the spacecraft. One such 6-axis measurement is taken for every sixty degrees of spacecraft rotation, which takes approximately one-half second. From the 36 spectra taken during each spin, the velocity distribution function is...
derived and its velocity moments obtained. This process is much simplified because simultaneous measurements are taken in each sense along each of the three axes. There are three energy ranges, 7.6 to 512 eV, 11 to 2062 eV, and 109 to 7285 eV, but only the first two were used in the present work. (The third energy range is designed to be used for the study of solar electron events.) An individual data point always has the same time resolution, and when the spacecraft is operating at high bit-rate (16 Kb s\(^{-1}\)) the telemetry system can transmit a complete measurement for every spin. At the low bit-rate (4 Kb s\(^{-1}\) for 80% of the time) the instrument obtains a measurement every fifth spin and is inoperative while this is being transmitted. Each of the six cylindrical electrostatic analyzers has two channeltron detectors, and the present measurements were made using both, in order to improve counting statistics at the higher energies. The angular field of view of each analyzer is 8.5 \(\times\) 11 deg, and sixteen energy steps are sampled with 5.5% FWHM energy resolution.

3. Observations

Figure 1 shows an example of a complete outbound traversal of the magnetosheath, on October 30, 1977, from the magnetopause at 00:45 UT to the bow shock at 03:50 UT. In this plot we show the density and bulk speed, the azimuth and latitude angles describing the bulk speed direction, the temperature, temperature anisotropy, the heat flux (in the rest frame of the plasma) and two angles.
defining its direction. We use this figure to illustrate qualitatively some general features of the data. Average conditions \((n = 8 \text{ cm}^{-3}, \ U = 425 \text{ km s}^{-1}, \ T_e = 2.2 \times 10^5 \text{ K})\) were indicated in the solar wind, across the bow shock these parameters jump to \((n = 22 \text{ cm}^{-3}, \ U = 250 \text{ km s}^{-1}, \ T_e = 5.5 \times 10^5 \text{ K})\). The directional changes are of the correct magnitude and in the correct direction to agree with the aerodynamic model of the magnetosheath flow. The heat flow is towards the Sun outside the bow shock, and towards the Earth inside the magnetosheath. Upstream heat flows have been previously described by the Los Alamos and GSFC groups (Feldman et al., 1975; Scudder et al., 1973), and are seen as a matter of course when measurements are made at a point connected to the bow shock by the interplanetary magnetic field. The flux of heat in the magnetosheath, larger in magnitude than that in the interplanetary medium, seems not to have been previously evaluated and discussed.

A feature commonly seen in the present magnetosheath traversals is the presence of a region or regions of space where the flow is less turbulent than the flow in the magnetosheath as a whole. In the present example one such region may be seen from about 02:07 UT to about 02:44 UT. The temperature and flow directions are seen to be more constant and the heat flux both larger and more constant there than elsewhere along the trajectory. These regions of less turbulent flow are usually seen in the mid-magnetosheath between the disturbed region immediately downstream of the bow shock, and the region of waves adjacent to the magnetopause. Another region of low turbulence, observed when the spacecraft was in the high bit-rate mode, is shown in Figure 2. A change in the magnetic field and heat flux directions occurred at 03:17 UT and the plasma became less turbulent, remaining so until 03:35 UT, and during this interval both the density and heat flux decreased. The form of the distribution function changed during these intervals corresponding to the change in density and heat flux as shown in Figure 3; the heat is carried by electrons with energies above 50 eV. The magnetosheath heat flux magnitude, which normally lies between \(5 \times 10^{-3}\) and \(5 \times 10^{-2}\) ergs cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), and has a mean value for the present observations of \(1.7 \times 10^{-2}\) ergs cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), is considerably larger than the interplanetary heat flux of \(\sim 8 \times 10^{-3}\) ergs cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) (Feldman et al., 1975). Striking a particle energy balance across the bow shock requires extensive detailed simultaneous measurements of solar wind and upstreaming ions and electrons, and of protons and electrons in the magnetosheath, and this cannot be carried out here. However, inserting average values into the equation

\[
[K.E. \text{ flux} + \text{Enthalpy flux} + Q_p + Q_e] = 0
\]

indicates that approximate balance can be obtained to \(\sim 20\%\) accuracy, assuming that \(Q_e\) dominates over \(Q_p\) in the sheath as it does in the solar wind.

The electron temperature anisotropy usually changes from less than unity to greater than unity when the magnetopause is crossed, Figure 1, and a density reduction, present in 25 of the 48 traversals examined to date, is clearly seen as
the magnetopause is approached. At the magnetopause crossing, in this example situated 37.5 deg from the subsolar point in the ecliptic plane and 25 deg above it, the flow direction changes in qualitative agreement with the presence of a boundary flow.

The flow speed $U$ has been calculated everywhere from the relation,

$$U = \frac{\int f_e(\vec{v}) \vec{v} \, dv \, d\omega}{\int f_e(\vec{v}) \, dv \, d\omega} \tag{1}$$

and a discussion of factors influencing this determination is in order. The value of $U$ depends upon the absolute differences between the counting rates of the
Fig. 3. Distribution functions observed during the period shown in Figure 2, along and perpendicular to the average magnetic field direction.

detectors in opposition in the two triads; such differences can arise because of detector area and efficiency differences, but these have been successfully controlled in this experiment. Certain detectors in the triad show a small effect at some deflection potentials due to photoelectrons produced inside the energy analyzer by sunlight scattered from the collimator, although the Sun does not shine directly into any of the analyzers at any time. This is negligible in the solar wind and magnetosheath, but, if uncorrected, would lead to the appearance of spurious bulk speeds in low density plasmas, such as occur in the magnetosphere and magnetotail. A deflection-potential and aspect-angle dependent correction, based upon backgrounds determined deep in the magnetosphere, is applied to remove these effects.

There is also the question of successfully evaluating the density, the denominator in the ratio (1) above, in the presence of spacecraft potential. The energy given to the incoming electrons while falling through the photoelectron sheath around the spacecraft may be comparable to or greater than the energy of bulk motion of the electrons. The ISEE spacecraft were constructed in such a way
as to make their surfaces approximate equipotentials, thus avoiding the appearance of a potential difference between the dark and sunlit sides. Thus, although the spacecraft doubtless rides up and down in potential in response to incident plasma flux (Montgomery et al., 1973), the bulk speed and temperature determinations should not be affected, provided the apparent density can be successfully corrected to the ambient density, since the photoelectron sheath should be
symmetric. Due to the low potentials normally present there, the observations in the solar wind and magnetosheath can be readily reduced, but in the magnetosphere, especially at higher latitudes and in the magnetotail, each period of data must be treated individually.

In Figure 4 we see four further sets of magnetopause crossing observations; the magnetosheath is characterized by densities of 10–30 and temperatures of $3 \times 10^5$ K and is on the right in the figure. The outer magnetosphere typically has much higher temperatures and lower densities; $kT_{en}$ changes from ~2 to ~200 in crossing the magnetopause. The upper two crossings show density reductions adjacent to the boundary, and significant wave activity (Crooker et al., 1977; Crooker and Siscoe, 1977). Between 10:05 and 10:20 UT on November 1 (third and fourth panels) we can see quasi-sinusoidal oscillations with $n$ and $T$ in phase (but out of phase with $B$). Multiple magnetopause transitions are very common, and these frequently have, in the electron data, the appearance of transitions between two definite stable states. This is consistent with the motion of a surface carrying waves whose amplitude is large compared to its thickness as suggested for the magnetosphere by (Aubry et al., 1971).

4. Discussion

A prominent feature of the magnetosheath is the density reduction which occurs adjacent to the magnetopause on about half of the traversals. This effect has been studied by Cummings and Coleman (1968) and Freeman et al. (1968), and modeled by Zwan and Wolf (1976). Observations by the plasma analyzer and magnetometer on IMP-6, analyzed by Crooker et al. (1977), exhibited such a density decrease in eleven of the seventeen crossings studied. It is of interest because it is a hydromagnetic effect (models without a magnetic field predict a density maximum at the magnetopause), and because the process is inconsistent with the occurrence of large-scale magnetic merging. Crooker and Siscoe (1977) have pointed out that this effect is a likely cause for a pressure anisotropy, in the sense of $P_\parallel < P_\perp$, in the dayside magnetosheath. The magnetosheath crossing shown in Figure 1 is a typical sample from the present measurements, and it can be seen that the electron temperature anisotropy $A (= T_\parallel/T_\perp)$ usually lies between 0.8 and 1.2. During the quiet periods it is characteristically less than unity, and in the region of waves adjacent to the magnetopause it is usually greater than unity. In the magnetosheath, the ions make a somewhat greater contribution to the pressure than do the electrons, so there is no contradiction in the present observations to the picture of Crooker and Siscoe (1977) of an inner magnetosheath unstable to the mirror instability over a large portion of the dawn sector.

Density reductions were observed adjacent to the magnetopause in 25 out of 48 magnetosheath traversals and we can compare their magnitude with the model of Zwan and Wolf (1976). Table I shows parameters for 15 cases for which sufficient information has been obtained to make an approximate quantitative test of the
TABLE I

Measured parameters for 15 magnetopause crossings showing density depletions adjacent to the magnetopause. DD is the decimal day of year, HH the hour, Z and Y are specified in \( R_x \), \( B_T \) and \( B_z \) (the interplanetary magnetic field and its Z component) in \( \gamma \), and \( D \) in km.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DD</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>( Z^2 + Y^2 )</th>
<th>( B_T )</th>
<th>( B_Z )</th>
<th>( M_A )</th>
<th>( D )</th>
<th>( \cos^{-1} X/R )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>0047</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>+2.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>0949</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>0804</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>2239</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>0825</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>0820</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>0123</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>0645</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 5. Measured values of \( D \), the thickness of the depletion layer adjacent to the magnetopause, plotted against the solar wind Alfvén mach number determined at the nearest shock crossing.
relation between $D$, the effective thickness of the layer of reduced density and the Alfvén mach number of the solar wind. This relation predicts that the higher the mach number characterizing the solar wind flow, the thinner the layer of reduced density will be. $D$ is defined as the distance from the magnetopause to the point where the density is half of the eventual value. The mach number is that obtained from the observations made in the solar wind a short distance upstream of the bow shock. Since the magnetopause is in motion, and all the necessary quantities change with time, we cannot expect to achieve a highly precise test, but approximate agreement and the correct slope of the dependence will increase our confidence in the correctness of the physical mechanism suggested to explain the effect. Figure 5 displays the data from Table I, together with the prediction of Zwan and Wolf. The theoretical curves marked $\sigma = 1.00$ and $\sigma = 1.25$ show the
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Fig. 6. A magnetopause crossing which did not show a depletion layer.
predicted effect of magnetic tension. The value $\sigma = 1.00$ represents the case in which the magnetic field line approximates a great circle on the magnetopause and the tension has no effect in accelerating the flux tube along the boundary, $\sigma = 1.25$ represents the case where there is a component along the boundary. There is considerable scatter among the points in Figure 5, and this is comparable to the distance between the two theoretical curves, but both the order of magnitude of $D$ and the slope of its variation with the mach number are in agreement with the theory. Since as a result of the average direction of the interplanetary magnetic field, the dawnside shock tends to be parallel and therefore more often unstable or pulsating than the shock on the duskside, data from the dusk magnetosheath may improve the precision of this work when it becomes available, since the same phenomenon should occur on each side of the noon meridian.

Figure 6 shows an example of a magnetopause crossing not showing a density reduction. The crossing takes place abruptly, although there is an indication of wave motion in the three-minute period immediately before the crossing. Examples can be found where there are multiple crossings of the magnetopause during a magnetosheath passage and some of these exhibit density reductions, while the others do not.

5. Conclusions

As a result of this preliminary survey of electron data obtained in the dawn magnetosheath it is hardly appropriate to draw other than tentative conclusions, with the understanding that they must be confirmed by future work. When that is understood, one can put down some features of these observations which appear to be correct and also to be relevant to understanding of the magnetosheath and magnetopause.

1. The flow is not uniformly turbulent all over the magnetosheath, regions of quiet flow often occurring sandwiched between turbulence associated with the two boundaries, the bow shock and the magnetopause.

2. The average electron heat flux in the magnetosheath is about twice that in the solar wind and is directed away from the bow shock.

3. Magnetopause crossings observed by the behavior of the low energy electrons often have the appearance of rather sharp transitions between two definite states. Although this is not always observed, it indicates that the magnetopause is often a thin boundary in motion or carrying large amplitude surface waves.

4. The density reduction, predicted as a result of plasma flowing out of flux tubes as they are convected up against the magnetopause, is observed to occur for about 50% of magnetosheath traversals. The width of this depletion layer, and its variation with solar wind mach number, are approximately as predicted by theory. Large amplitude waves are observed in the depletion layer. None of these
features of the data necessarily occur in a given crossing, but all are frequently observed. Since it takes approximately four hours for the spacecraft to cross the magnetosheath it is not to be expected that Figure 1, for example, represents anything like a time-stationary situation. The present observations do, however, provide support for the theoretical models of Zwan and Wolf (1976) and Crooker and Siscoe (1977). Since the presence of a depletion layer is inconsistent with large scale reconnection, these observations favor the idea of the predominance of locally confined merging processes, as suggested by Haerendel et al. (1978).
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