

Mercury's Cross-tail Current Sheet: Structure, X-line Location and Stress Balance

Gangkai Poh¹, James A. Slavin¹, Xianzhe Jia¹, Jim M. Raines¹, Suzanne M. Imber², Wei-Jie Sun^{3,4}, Daniel J. Gershman⁵, Gina A. DiBraccio⁶, Kevin J. Genestreti^{7,8}, Andy W. Smith⁹

1 Department of Climate and Space Sciences and Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA,

2 Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom,

3 Key Laboratory of Earth and Planetary Physics, Institute of Geology and Geophysics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China,

4 School of Earth and Space Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China,

5 Heliophysics Science Division, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA,

6 Solar System Exploration Division, NASA Goddard Space Flight, Greenbelt, Maryland, USA,

7 Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Texas San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas, USA,

8 Space Science and Engineering Division, Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas, USA,

9 Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK,

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1002/2016GL071612](https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071612)

Abstract:

The structure, X-line location and magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) stress balance of Mercury's magnetotail were examined between $-2.6 < X_{\text{MSM}} < -1.4 R_{\text{M}}$ using MESSENGER measurements observed from 319 central plasma sheet (CPS) crossings. The mean plasma β in the CPS calculated from MESSENGER data is ~ 6 . The CPS magnetic field was southward (i.e., tailward of X-line) 2 – 18% of the time. Extrapolation of downtail variations in B_z indicates an average X-line location at $-3 R_{\text{M}}$. Modelling of magnetic field measurements produced a cross-tail current sheet (CS) thickness, current density and inner CS edge location of $0.39 R_{\text{M}}$, 92 nA/m^2 and $-1.22 R_{\text{M}}$, respectively. Application of MHD stress balance suggests that heavy planetary ions may be important in maintaining stress balance within Mercury's CPS. Qualitative similarities between Mercury's and Earth's magnetotail are remarkable given the differences in upstream conditions, internal plasma composition, finite gyro-radius scaling, and Mercury's lack of ionosphere.

1. Introduction

The dominant process transferring solar wind energy into Mercury's magnetosphere is magnetic reconnection at the dayside magnetopause [Slavin *et al.*, 2009; DiBraccio *et al.*, 2013]. Following dayside reconnection, opened magnetic flux is transported anti-sunward by the flow of the solar wind, forming a magnetotail with two open magnetic field regions, i.e., the two tail lobes. These open field lines have one end connected to the planetary magnetic field and the other to the interplanetary magnetic field (IMF). The northern and southern tail lobes contain field oriented in opposite directions. Separating the two tail lobes is the higher β (i.e. ratio of plasma thermal to magnetic pressure) and closed field line region known as the plasma sheet. Between each tail lobe and the plasma sheet is a region of lower- β (~ 0.1 at Earth [Baumjohann *et al.*, 1988]) flux tubes recently "closed" by magnetic reconnection known as the plasma sheet boundary layer (PSBL). The CPS layer contains an embedded cross-tail current, which flows in the dawn-to-dusk direction [Rich *et al.*, 1972]. The crossing of a CPS is identified by the reversal of the sunward/anti-sunward component of the magnetic field and a decrease in the magnitude

[B]. Due to the weak magnetic field and presence of hot, dense plasma, β is typically $\gg 1$ in Mercury's CPS [Gershman *et al.*, 2014].

The MErcury Surface, Space ENvironment, GEochemistry, and Ranging (MESSENGER) spacecraft conducted three flybys of Mercury before it became the first spacecraft to orbit Mercury on 18th March 2011. During these flybys, MESSENGER sampled Mercury's magnetotail at downtail distances up to $3 R_M$ away from Mercury and provided an opportunity to characterize the structure and dynamics of the magnetotail. Initial analysis of MESSENGER flyby data [Slavin *et al.*, 2010; 2012a] have shown that Mercury's magnetotail is highly variable with timescales of seconds to minutes, which is consistent with the high magnetopause reconnection rates that had been predicted for Mercury [Slavin and Holzer, 1979]. MESSENGER observed relatively large magnetic field component normal to the magnetopause [DiBraccio *et al.*, 2013] and showers of large flux transfer events [Slavin *et al.*, 2012b; Imber *et al.*, 2014] which are indicative of high magnetopause reconnection activity, increase the tail magnetic flux content by up to a factor of 2 [Slavin *et al.*, 2010; 2012a] via the Dungey cycle [Dungey, 1961] at Mercury. This intense loading of magnetic flux in the lobes increases the overall flaring of the nightside magnetopause and enhances the solar wind pressure exerted on the magnetotail. These pressure enhancements lead to thinning of the cross-tail CS and tail reconnection. Observations of plasmoids [Slavin *et al.*, 2012a; DiBraccio *et al.*, 2015; Sun *et al.*, 2016], dipolarizations [Sundberg *et al.*, 2012] and substorms [Slavin *et al.*, 2010; Sun *et al.*, 2015] strongly support the rapid dissipation of magnetotail energy through magnetic reconnection in a

manner similar to that observed at Earth [Sharma *et al.*, 2008]. MESSENGER's orbit around Mercury provided continuous magnetic field [Anderson *et al.*, 2007] and plasma ion [Andrews *et al.*, 2007] measurements, which allow the large-scale structure in Mercury's magnetotail to be characterized. Here we examine the structure, X-line location and MHD stress balance in Mercury's magnetotail.

2. MESSENGER Instrumentation and Tail Current Sheet Crossing Identification

In this study, we utilize the full-resolution data from MESSENGER's Magnetometer (MAG) (20 vectors/s) and Fast Imaging Plasma Spectrometer (FIPS) (1 energy scan/10s). Figure 1a shows MESSENGER's magnetic field observations during a traversal of Mercury's cross-tail CS on 3 February 2013 in the aberrated Mercury solar magnetospheric (MSM') coordinate system. The MSM system is centered on Mercury's offset internal dipole [Alexeev *et al.*, 2010; Anderson *et al.*, 2011], the X- and Z-axes are sunward and parallel to the planetary spin axis, respectively. The Y-axis completes the right-handed system. We accounted for the aberration effect (i.e., orbital motion of Mercury with respect to the solar wind) by rotating the MSM X- and Y-axes such that Y is opposite to the solar wind velocity vector and corresponds to the central axis of the magnetotail. The rotation angle was calculated using daily averages of Mercury's orbital motion and an assumed radial solar wind velocity of 400 km/s. In Figure 1, the spacecraft first encountered the southern lobe, characterized by the strong, low-variance magnetic fields of ~ 60

nT, predominantly oriented in the negative B_x direction. The PSBL (yellow) was identified by small decreases in $|\mathbf{B}|$ ($\sim 10\%$) and moderate fluctuations of ~ 20 nT as compared to the lobe field [Slavin *et al.*, 1985]. The spacecraft then entered the CPS (red) characterized by a further decrease in the $|\mathbf{B}|$, and reversal of B_x across the magnetotail current layer. Lastly, MESSENGER entered the northern lobe when $|\mathbf{B}|$ increased back to 60 nT with low levels of fluctuations in $|\mathbf{B}|$. Before exiting into the northern lobe, MESSENGER observed two large-scale CS oscillations or flapping motions (i.e., fluctuations in B_x , which are common in planetary magnetotails [see Volwerk *et al.*, 2013]).

We surveyed four years of MESSENGER's MAG data and identified a total of 319 CPS crossings based on the following selection requirements:

- Well-defined boundary between the moderately fluctuating magnetic field intensity in the PSBL and the highly fluctuating, large decrease in magnetic field intensity in the CPS.
- Clear reversal of B_x embedded in the CPS corresponding to the cross-tail CS.
- Average $|\mathbf{B}|$ in the CPS must be less than 50% of the $|\mathbf{B}|$ lobe averaged over the lobe interval during individual traversal.

The locations of each of the CPS crossings identified in this study are plotted in Figure 1b in the equatorial ($X'_{MSM}-Y'_{MSM}$) and meridional ($X'_{MSM}-Z'_{MSM}$) planes along with the T96-modelled magnetic field lines [Tsyganenko, 1996] scaled to the size of Mercury's magnetosphere by

dividing with a factor of 8 [Ogilvie *et al.*, 1977]. The CPS crossings were evenly distributed around midnight ($Y'_{MSM} \sim 0$) and covered a range of downtail distances from $-1.1 - -3.0 R_M$.

3. Analysis

3.1 Downtail Variation of CPS and Lobe Magnetic Field

We examined the variation of the magnetic field intensity in the lobe (B_{lobe}) and CPS (B_{CPS}) as a function of downtail distances (i.e., X'_{MSM}). Using MESSENGER's (MSGR) and Mariner 10's (M10) flyby magnetic field data, Slavin *et al.* [2012a] showed that a power law relation can be used to describe the decrease in B_{lobe} with X'_{MSM} due to the decrease in flaring of the magnetotail as it becomes more cylindrical:

$$|B_{lobe}|(|X'_{MSM}|) = A|X'_{MSM}|^G + B_0 \quad (1)$$

where A is the scaling constant, G is the power-law exponent and B_0 is the asymptotic magnetic field. The MSGR $\langle B_{lobe} \rangle$ values are averaged in $0.1 R_M$ bins along X'_{MSM} for the entire orbital phase and displayed in Figure 2a. Our result shows that B_{lobe} falls off with $G \sim 3.1 \pm 0.1$ and has an asymptotic value of $B_0 \sim 41.4 \pm 1.4$ nT. The fitted curve suggests that lobe flaring ceases near $X'_{MSM} \sim -3.5 R_M$, where B_{lobe} becomes constant. Figure 2b shows the MSGR $\langle B_{CPS} \rangle$ for orbital phase as a function of X'_{MSM} , where all measured B_{CPS} values are averaged in $0.1 R_M$ bins. Our results show that $\langle B_{CPS} \rangle$ decreases with $G \sim -8.9 \pm 0.1$ and asymptotes at $X'_{MSM} \sim -1.8 R_M$ with

$B_0 \sim 16.6 \pm 0.7$ nT. As compared to *Slavin et al.* [2012a] earlier analysis of Mercury's CPS during the first flyby (M1) when the IMF was northward, our observation of weaker magnetic field is attributed to the presence of a denser and hotter plasma sheet. In fact, assuming pressure balance between the lobe and CPS, we can derive an equation for the CPS $\beta = \left[\left(\frac{B_{lobe}^2}{B_{CPS}^2} \right) - 1 \right]$. The asymptotic lobe and CPS field intensities determined earlier imply an average value of $\beta \sim 5.2$. This agrees with our calculated β of ~ 6.5 using FIPS measurements (not shown here).

The normalized probability distribution of B_Z in Figure 2c is derived by binning all measurements into 5 nT bins of B_Z , four X'_{MSM} ranges between -1.4 to -2.6 R_M at intervals of 0.3 R_M and within $\pm 0.4 R_M$ away from $Y'_{MSM} = 0$. In a 2-dimensional geometry of the X-line, the two anti-parallel lobe fields reconnect to form closed (open) magnetic field lines which move sunward (anti-sunward) at the local Alfvén speed. The closed, sunward (open, anti-sunward) moving magnetic field line has a positive (negative) B_Z polarity. Figure 2c shows that B_Z is predominantly positive for all X'_{MSM} ranges and the $\langle B_Z \rangle$ of the distributions decreases with increasing X'_{MSM} . Therefore, we can conclude that MESSENGER crosses the CPS slightly planetward of the statistical X-line, also known as the Near Mercury Neutral Line (NMNL), most of the time. Not shown here, the mean of all measured B_Z measurements is ~ 9.5 nT.

The probability distribution in Figure 2c also shows that MESSENGER spent $\sim 2\%$ of the CPS crossing occurred tailward of the X-line ($B_Z < 0$). As X'_{MSM} decreases, the time MESSENGER spent tailward of the X-line also increases. At the furthest downtail region ($-2.3 <$

$X'_{MSM} (R_M) < -2.6$), MESSENGER spend $\sim 18\%$ of its CPS crossing time tailward of the X-line. Figure 2d shows the relationship between the percentage time MESSENGER spent tailward of the X-line (Σt) and X'_{MSM} . We fit the data using an exponential function and estimated the statistical location of the NMNL (i.e., $\Sigma t = 50\%$) to be $X'_{MSM} \sim -2.95 R_M$.

3.2. Harris Current Sheet Modelling

Due to MESSENGER's highly-inclined ($\sim 80^\circ$) orbit, the spacecraft trajectories through the cross-tail CS are expected to be nearly normal to the tail current sheet on average. The Harris current sheet model [Harris, 1962] is the one-dimensional equilibrium solution to the Maxwell-Vlasov equation that describes the planetary magnetotail magnetic field structure in the Z'_{MSM} direction. It has been used extensively in magnetotail studies by Cluster [e.g., Nakamura *et al.*, 2002; Narita *et al.*, 2013] and reconnection simulations [e.g., Birn *et al.*, 2001]. The relationship between B_x and the cross-tail current density (J_Y) is given by:

$$B_x(z) = B_0 \tanh\left(\frac{z - z_0}{L}\right) \quad (2)$$

$$J_Y(z) = \frac{B_0}{\mu_0 L} \operatorname{sech}^2\left(\frac{z - z_0}{L}\right) \quad (3)$$

where B_0 is the asymptotic lobe field, z_0 is the north-south position of the CS center and L is the characteristic half-thickness of the CS. These are free parameters, which we determined by a least-square fitting procedure of the Harris model to the magnetic field measurements.

Figure 3a shows MESSENGER's trajectory across the cross-tail CS on 23 August 2011 in the meridional plane. Due to the high-latitude ($\sim 60^\circ$) periapsis of its orbit, MESSENGER moved rapidly towards Mercury at high northern latitudes, as it leaves the CPS, and the dipole magnetic field becomes dominant. For this reason, the fitting procedure is performed only for the southern half of the CS (i.e., $B_X < 0$). To remove the high frequency B_X fluctuations common to Mercury's CPS, 40-s sliding boxcar averages of the magnetic field are used to low-pass filter the data prior to fitting. Figure 3b shows the averaged B_X measurements (black) and the Harris model result (red) for the 23 August 2011 CPS crossing as a function of Z'_{MSM} . The normalized chi-square χ^2 for this fit is 0.005. This event meets the requirement of $\chi^2 \leq 0.01$ that we have set for acceptable fits. Out of the 319 cross-tail CS crossings identified in this study, 234 ($\sim 73\%$) were found to fit the Harris model with $\chi^2 \leq 0.01$. The high percentage of successful model fits suggests that the longer-wavelength structure of Mercury's cross-tail CS is usually well-represented by a Harris-type CS. Figures 3c and 3d show the distribution of full thickness ($2L$) and current density averaged over each CS crossing (J_{CS}) calculated from the Harris fitting procedure, respectively. Our analysis indicates that Mercury's CS has a mean $\langle 2L \rangle$ and $\langle J_{CS} \rangle$ of $\sim 0.39 R_M$ and ~ 92 nA/m², respectively.

3.3. Downtail Variation of B_Z and Plasma Pressure in the Central Plasma Sheet

Author Manuscript

We also examined how B_Z in the CPS varies with X'_{MSM} . The measured B_Z in the CPS can be modelled as a superposition of Mercury's intrinsic northward dipole field ($B_{Z,DIPOLE}$), magnetic field perturbations due to the cross-tail CS (δB_Z) and the contribution from Chapman-Ferraro current on the magnetopause surface ($B_{Z,CF}$). $B_{Z,CF}$ decreases approximately as $1/r$ away from the magnetopause surface. With a total current of $\sim 10^5$ A, we estimate that $B_{Z,CF}$ is only $\sim 1 - 4$ nT in the CPS, which is negligible as compared to $B_{Z,DIPOLE}$ or δB_Z . Hence, the $B_{Z,CF}$ term is ignored in our calculations.

The B_Z and $B_{Z,DIPOLE}$ as a function of X'_{MSM} are shown in Figure 4a. We calculated δB_Z by subtracting $B_{Z,DIPOLE}$ from B_Z as a function of X'_{MSM} as shown in Figure 4b. These data show a distinct local minimum at $X'_{MSM} \sim -1.22 R_M$. This minimum corresponds to the inner edge of the CS, where the southward magnetic field perturbation from the CS is the strongest and decreases exponentially sunward from this point. We also calculated the magnetic field perturbation of a two-dimensional semi-infinite CS slab model (red line) with thickness and uniform current density of $\sim 0.39 R_M$ and 78 nA/m^2 taken from our fitting of the Harris model to the magnetic field profiles measured across the CS. The locations of the inner and outer edge of the CS slab model are free parameters in the least-square fitting between $X'_{MSM} \sim -1.05$ to $-2.85 R_M$. The outer edge of the CS slab model is $\sim -4.5 R_M$. We used the median, instead of the mean, of the current density distribution in this slab model since the median is a more accurate measure of the true distribution due to the presence of outliers (events with high current density).

We also determined the downtail variation of the thermal plasma pressure in the CPS using the FIPS H⁺ plasma data ($P_{\text{th,FIPS}}$). In this manner, the H⁺ density (n) and temperature (T) were determined with ~ 1 minute resolution and used to compute $\langle P_{\text{th,FIPS}} \rangle$ for each CPS crossing. The values were used to determine the downtail variation as shown in Figure 4c. The downtail profile of $P_{\text{th,FIPS}}$ is similar to that of $|B_{\text{lobe}}|^2$, which is expected when the CPS plasma thermal pressure is balanced by the lobe magnetic pressure. To determine the global stress balance of Mercury's CPS, we approximate, to zero-order, the downtail profile of $P_{\text{th,FIPS}}$ between $X'_{MSM} = -1.2$ and $-2.2 R_M$ to be linear. It was found that $\langle P_{\text{th,FIPS}} \rangle$ decreases linearly at a rate of $\sim 0.62 \pm 0.02$ nPa/ R_M , and reaches a constant value of ~ 0.7 nPa at $X'_{MSM} \sim -2.0 R_M$.

3.4 Central Plasma Sheet Stress Balance

For an isotropic plasma sheet in static equilibrium (i.e., $\frac{dv}{dt} = 0$), ∇P must be balanced by the magnetic stress ($\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}$) (i.e., $\nabla P = \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}$). Given $\langle J_{CS} \rangle \sim 78$ nA/m² and $\langle B_Z \rangle \sim 9.5$ nT as determined earlier, we estimate the $\langle \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B} \rangle$ stress to be ~ 1.81 nPa/ R_M , which is ~ 3 times greater than $\frac{dP_{\text{th}}}{dX}$ (~ 0.62 nPa/ R_M) determined by FIPS. The discrepancy suggests that pressure gradient in the H⁺ ions alone is insufficient to maintain stress balance in the measured magnetic field in Mercury's CPS. This begs the question of whether the pressure gradient contribution from the heavy planetary ions plays an important part in maintaining equilibrium in Mercury's CPS as is the case in Earth's magnetotail [Kistler *et al.*, 2005]. Gershman *et al.*, [2014] showed that Na⁺ ions are present with a number density $\sim 10\%$ of the H⁺ density. For the heavy planetary

ions to play an important role in maintaining equilibrium in Mercury's CPS, the rate of decrease of plasma pressure with X'_{MSM} would have to be greater than that of the protons. *Rich et al.* [1972] showed that pressure anisotropy in the dominant H^+ ion is required in Earth's CPS to maintain stress balance. However, further analyses of the FIPS measurements, which are beyond the scope of this study, are required in order to evaluate the possible role of proton temperature anisotropies in maintaining equilibrium within Mercury's CPS.

4. Discussion and Summary

We have conducted the first comprehensive study of Mercury's central plasma sheet and the embedded cross-tail current sheet using MESSENGER's MAG and FIPS measurements. Results from the analysis of 319 cross-tail CS traversals indicate that the magnetic field profiles are well-described using a Harris model, with full CS thickness and mean current density of $0.39 R_M$ and 92 nA/m^2 respectively. This thickness is in good agreement with earlier results [*Johnson et al.* 2012; *Sun et al.* 2016]. Our current density determination is much higher than at Earth, i.e., ~ 4 to 25 nA/m^2 [*Artemyev et al.*, 2011], but it is in good agreement with global MHD simulations of Mercury's magnetosphere [*Jia et al.*, 2015].

We also report the first determination of the inner edge of Mercury's CS derived from MESSENGER's magnetic field data. This local minimum in δB_Z indicates that the inner edge of the CS is located at $\sim -1.22 R_M$. At Earth, the inner edge of the CS is located at $X'_{GSM} \sim 10 - 12 R_E$ during quiet intervals and shifts earthward to $\sim 6 - 7 R_E$ during active times [*Wang et al.*,

2004; Kalegaev *et al.*, 2014]. Using the scaling factor of ~ 8 , the quiet-time location of the inner edge of Mercury's CS based on the Earth value would be $\sim 1.25 R_M$, which agrees well our MESSENGER results. Determination of the inner edge location is important to better constrain the physical properties of Mercury's CS in empirical [Alexeev *et al.*, 2010, Korth *et al.*, 2015] and global simulation models [Trávníček *et al.*, 2007; Jia *et al.*, 2015].

Our statistical analyses of the MESSENGER data show that B_{lobe} decreases with increasing X'_{MSM} with an exponent of ~ 3.1 . At Earth, this exponent ranges from ~ 0.9 to 2.7 for downtail distances [Nakai *et al.*, 1999], which is lower than our Mercury results. This suggests that magnetotail flaring should cease comparatively closer to Mercury than is the case at Earth. At Earth, the flaring of the lobes is observed to cease at $X_{GSM} \sim -100 - -120 R_E$ [Slavin *et al.*, 1985]. We would expect flaring of Mercury's lobe to cease at $\sim -12 - -15 R_M$, which is outside the range of MESSENGER's orbit. Hence the distance at which the flaring ceases is still an open question, calling for future measurements at $X'_{MSM} < -3 R_M$. The rate of decrease of B_{CPS} was also shown to follow a power law, with an exponent of ~ 8.9 . The corresponding rate of decrease in Earth's CPS ranges from ~ 1.14 to 3.36 for different downtail distances [Nakai *et al.*, 1999], which is significantly slower than the Mercury values determined here.

Our analysis shows that the $\langle B_Z \rangle$ in the CS region sampled by MESSENGER is primarily positive, which suggests that the spacecraft spent most of its time crossing the CS planetward of the NMNL. The estimated mean location of the NMNL based upon the rate of decrease in B_Z is $\sim -2.95 R_M$. The location of the near Earth neutral line (NENL) had been a widely debated within

the community due to importance of reconnection onset location in substorm models. Similarly, the location of the NMNL is important in understanding Mercury's plasma sheet conditions during substorm initiation. The average NENL location has been shown to occur between $X_{\text{GSM}} \sim -20$ and $-30 R_{\text{E}}$ [e.g. Nagai and Machida, 1998]. A THEMIS survey of magnetotail flux ropes and travelling compression regions estimated the NENL to be located closer to $-30 R_{\text{E}}$ during solar minimum [Imber et al., 2011]. The location of NMNL is then expected to be $\sim -2.5 - 3.8 R_{\text{M}}$, which agrees with our estimated NMNL location of $-2.95 R_{\text{M}}$. Furthermore, Slavin et al. [2012a] and DiBraccio et al. [2015] estimated the location of the NMNL to be between ~ -2 and $-3 R_{\text{M}}$ based on the spatial distribution of sunward and anti-sunward flux ropes. Their NMNL location is closer to Mercury, most likely because they were studying intervals of intense reconnection during which X-line is expected to form closer to the planet.

Analysis of $\langle P_{\text{th}} \rangle$ in Mercury's CPS indicated that it decreases linearly with X'_{MSM} between -1.2 and $-2.2 R_{\text{M}}$ at a rate of $0.62 \pm 0.02 \text{ nPa}/R_{\text{M}}$. However, this is only $\sim 33\%$ of the mean measured $J \times B$ in the CPS ($\sim 1.81 \text{ nPa}/R_{\text{M}}$). Hence, we find that the pressure gradient from H^+ is insufficient to maintain pressure balance within Mercury's CPS. Contributions from heavy planetary ions and/or H^+ temperature anisotropy are necessary, but further analysis of FIPS measurements is beyond the scope of this study.

In summary, we examined the structure of Mercury's magnetotail. We also determined that average NMNL is located at $X'_{\text{MSM}} \sim -3 R_{\text{M}}$ and heavy ions are important in maintaining stress balance within Mercury's CPS. Investigation has revealed many qualitative similarities between

Mercury's and Earth's magnetotail, despite the differences in upstream conditions, internal plasma composition, finite gyro-radius scalings, and Mercury's lack of ionosphere (see review by *Jackman et al.* [2014]). MESSENGER's orbit only allows us to directly observe magnetotail structures and processes in Mercury's near-tail region. Hence, to understand the location and nature of the NMNL and related downtail evolution of Mercury's tail structure, observations at $X_{\text{MSM}} \leq -3 R_{\text{M}}$ are necessary. Fortunately, this will take place when measurements from the upcoming European Space Agency's Bepi-Columbo mission, which consists of two spacecraft orbiting Mercury at apogees of $\sim -1.6 R_{\text{M}}$ and $-5 R_{\text{M}}$, becomes available in the next decade.

Acknowledgements

All data analyzed in this paper are archived with the NASA Planetary Data System. Support was provided by NASA Discovery Data Analysis Program grants NNX15K88G and NNX15AL01G, Heliophysics Supporting Research NNX15AJ68G, Living with a Star NNX16AJ67G and Solar System Workings Program grant NNX15AH28G to the University of Michigan. D.J.G and G.A.D were supported by NASA ROSES grant NNX16AJ05G. G.A.D was supported by a NASA Postdoctoral Program appointment at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, administered by Universities Space Research Association through a contract with NASA. S.I.M acknowledges the support of the Leverhulme Trust.

Figures:




Figure 1: (a) Full-resolution MESSENGER magnetic field measurements on February 3rd 2013. (b) Average positions of each CS crossing in the equatorial (left) and meridional (right) plane. Model bow shock (BS) and magnetopause (MP) from *Winslow et al.* [2013] are shown.




Figure 2: (a) B_{lobe} and (b) B_{CPS} as a function of X'_{MSM} . A power law relation was fitted to the data points (red line) with fitting coefficients shown in the table. The histogram for number of data points in each bin is also shown. (c) Normalized probability distributions of B_Z for four downtail

Autho

regions and the colored arrows represent the mean of each respective distribution. (d) Σt as a function of X'_{MSM} . An exponential relation (red line) is fitted to the data points.

Author Manuscript




Figure 5. (a) Meridional view of MESSENGER crossing of the cross-tail CS on 23 August 2011. Arrow denotes the spacecraft travelling direction. (b) B_x measurements as a function of Z'_{MSM} . A

Aut

Harris CS model is fitted to the smoothed data. Histograms of (c) $2L$ and (d) J_{CS} calculated from Harris model fits. μ and M represents mean and median of the distribution, respectively.

Author Manuscript




Figure 4: (a) Magnitude of measured B_Z and dipole magnetic field in the CPS and (b) δB_Z as a function of X'_{MSM} . (c) $P_{th,FIPS}$ as a function of X_{MSM} .

References

- Alexeev, I. I., E. S. Belenkaya, S. Yu. Bobrovnikov, J. A. Slavin, and M. Sarantos (2008), Paraboloid model of Mercury's magnetosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **113**, A12210, doi:10.1029/2008JA013368.
- Alexeev, I. I., et al. (2010), Mercury's magnetospheric magnetic field after the first two MESSENGER flybys, *Icarus*, **209**, 23–39, doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2010.01.024.
- Anderson, B. J., M. H. Acuña, D. A. Lohr, J. Scheifele, A. Raval, H. Korth, and J. A. Slavin (2007), The Magnetometer instrument on MESSENGER, *Space Sci. Rev.*, **131**, 417–450, doi:10.1007/s11214-007-9246-7.
- Anderson, B. J., C. L. Johnson, H. Korth, M. E. Purucker, R. M. Winslow, J. A. Slavin, S. C. Solomon, R. L. McNutt Jr., J. M. Raines, and T. H. Zurbuchen (2011), The global magnetic field of Mercury from MESSENGER orbital observations, *Science*, **333**, 1859–1862, doi:10.1126/science.1211001.
- Andrews, G. B., et al. (2007), The Energetic Particle and Plasma Spectrometer instrument on the MESSENGER spacecraft, *Space Sci. Rev.*, **131**, 523–556, doi:10.1007/s11214-007-9272-5.
- Artemyev, A. V., A. A. Petrukovich, R. Nakamura, and L. M. Zelenyi (2011), Cluster statistics of thin current sheets in the Earth magnetotail: Specifics of the dawn flank, proton temperature profiles and electrostatic effects, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **116**, A09233, doi:10.1029/2011JA016801.
- Baumjohann, W., G. Paschmann, N. Sckopke, C. A. Cattell, and C. W. Carlson (1988), Average ion moments in the plasma sheet boundary layer, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **93**(A10), 11507–11520, doi:10.1029/JA093iA10p11507.

- Birn, J., et al. (2001), Geospace Environmental Modeling (GEM) Magnetic Reconnection Challenge, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *106*(A3), 3715–3719, doi:10.1029/1999JA900449.
- DiBraccio, G. A., J. A. Slavin, S. A. Boardsen, B. J. Anderson, H. Korth, T. H. Zurbuchen, J. M. Raines, D. N. Baker, R. L. McNutt Jr., and S. C. Solomon (2013), MESSENGER observations of magnetopause structure and dynamics at Mercury, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *118*, 997–1008, doi:10.1002/jgra.50123.
- DiBraccio, G. A., et al. (2015), MESSENGER observations of flux ropes in Mercury's magnetotail, *Planet. Space Sci.*, *115*, 77–89, doi:10.1016/j.pss.2014.12.016.
- Dungey, J. W. (1961), Interplanetary magnetic fields and the auroral zones, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, *6*, 47 – 48.
- Gershman, D. J., J. A. Slavin, J. M. Raines, T. H. Zurbuchen, B. J. Anderson, H. Korth, D. N. Baker, and S. C. Solomon (2014), Ion kinetic properties in Mercury's pre-midnight plasma sheet, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *41*, 5740–5747, doi:10.1002/2014GL060468.
- Harris, E. G., On a plasma sheath separating regions of oppositely directed magnetic field, *Nuovo Cimento*, *23*, 115–121, 1962.
- Jackman, C. M., et al. (2014), Large-scale structure and dynamics of the magnetotails of Mercury, Earth, Jupiter and Saturn, *Space Sci. Rev.*, *182*, 85–154, doi:10.1007/s11214-014-0060-8.
- Kalegaev V.V., Alexeev I.I., Nazarkov I.S., Angelopoulos V., Runov A. (2014) On the large-scale structure of the tail current as measured by THEMIS, *Advances in Space Research*, *Volume 54, Issue 9*, Pages 1773-1785, ISSN 0273-1177, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2014.07.019>.
- Kistler, L. M., et al. (2005), Contribution of nonadiabatic ions to the cross-tail current in an O⁺ dominated thin current sheet, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *110*, A06213, doi:10.1029/2004JA010653.
- Korth, H., N. A. Tsyganenko, C. L. Johnson, L. C. Philpott, B. J. Anderson, M. M. Al Asad, S. C. Solomon, and R. L. McNutt Jr. (2015), Modular model for Mercury's magnetospheric magnetic field confined within the average observed magnetopause. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *120*, 4503–4518. doi: 10.1002/2015JA021022.

Imber, S. M., J. A. Slavin, H. U. Auster, and V. Angelopoulos (2011), A THEMIS survey of flux ropes and traveling compression regions: Location of the near-Earth reconnection site during solar minimum, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *116*, A02201, doi:10.1029/2010JA016026.

Imber, S. M., J. A. Slavin, S. A. Boardsen, B. J. Anderson, H. Korth, R. L. McNutt Jr., and S. C. Solomon (2014), MESSENGER observations of large dayside flux transfer events: Do they drive Mercury's substorm cycle?, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *119*, 5613–5623, doi:10.1002/2014JA019884.

Jia, X., J. A. Slavin, T. I. Gombosi, L. K. S. Daldorff, G. Toth, and B. van der Holst (2015), Global MHD simulations of Mercury's magnetosphere with coupled planetary interior: Induction effect of the planetary conducting core on the global interaction. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *120*, 4763–4775. doi: 10.1002/2015JA021143.

Johnson, C. L., et al. (2012), MESSENGER observations of Mercury's magnetic field structure, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *117*, E00L14, doi:10.1029/2012JE004217.

Nagai, T. and Machida, S. (1998) Magnetic Reconnection in the Near-Earth Magnetotail, in *New Perspectives on the Earth's Magnetotail* (eds A. Nishida, D.N. Baker and S.W.H. Cowley), American Geophysical Union, Washington, D. C.. doi: 10.1029/GM105p0211.

Nakai, H., Y. Kamide, and C. T. Russell (1999), Dependence of the near-Earth magnetotail magnetic field on storm and substorm activities, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *104*(A10), 22701–22711, doi:10.1029/1999JA900273.

Nakamura, R., et al., (2002), Fast flow during current sheet thinning, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *29*(23), 2140, doi:10.1029/2002GL016200.

Narita, T., Nakamura, R., and Baumjohann, W. (2013) Cluster as current sheet surveyor in the magnetotail, *Ann. Geophys.*, *31*, 1605-1610, doi:10.5194/angeo-31-1605-2013.

Ogilvie, K. W., J. D. Scudder, V. M. Vasyliunas, R. E. Hartle, and G. L. Siscoe (1977), Observations at the planet Mercury by the plasma electron experiment: Mariner 10, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *82*, 1807–1824, doi:10.1029/JA082i013p01807.

Raines, J. M., J. A. Slavin, T. H. Zurbuchen, G. Gloeckler, B. J. Anderson, D. N. Baker, H. Korth, S. M. Krimigis, and R. L. McNutt Jr. (2011), MESSENGER observations of the

Author Manuscript

plasma environment near Mercury, *Planet. Space Sci.*, 59, 2004–2015, doi:10.1016/j.pss.2011.02.004.

Rich, F. J., V. M. Vasyliunas, and R. A. Wolf (1972), On the balance of stresses in the plasma sheet, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 77(25), 4670–4676, doi:10.1029/JA077i025p04670.

Sharma, A. S., et al. (2008), Transient and localized processes in the magnetotail: A review, *Ann. Geophys.*, 26, 955–1006.

Slavin, J. A. and R. E. Holzer (1979), The effect of erosion on the solar wind stand-off distance at Mercury, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 84, 2076–2082, doi:10.1029/JA084iA05p02076.

Slavin, J. A., E. J. Smith, D. G. Sibeck, D. N. Baker, R. D. Zwickl, and S.-I. Akasofu (1985), An ISEE-3 study of average and substorm conditions in the distant magnetotail, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 90, 10,875–10,895, doi:10.1029/JA090iA11p10875.

Slavin, J. A., et al. (2009), MESSENGER observations of magnetic reconnection in Mercury's magnetosphere, *Science*, 324, 606–610, doi:10.1126/science.1172011.

Slavin, J. A., et al. (2010), MESSENGER observations of extreme loading and unloading of Mercury's magnetic tail, *Science*, 329, 665–668, doi:10.1126/science.1188067.

Slavin, J. A., et al. (2012a), MESSENGER and Mariner 10 flyby observations of magnetotail structure and dynamics at Mercury, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, A01215, doi:10.1029/2011JA016900.

Slavin, J. A., et al. (2012b), MESSENGER observations of a flux-transfer-event shower at Mercury, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, A00M06, doi:10.1029/2012JA017926.

Sun, W. J., J. A. Slavin, S. Fu, J. M. Raines, Q.-G. Zong, S. M. Imber, Q. Shi, Z. Yao, G. Poh, D. J. Gershman, Z. Pu, T. Sundberg, B. J. Anderson, H. Korth, and D. N. Baker (2015), MESSENGER observations of magnetospheric substorm activity in Mercury's near magnetotail. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 3692–3699. doi: 10.1002/2015GL064052.

Sun, W. J., S. Y. Fu, J. A. Slavin, J. M. Raines, Q. G. Zong, G. K. Poh, and T. H. Zurbuchen (2016), Spatial distribution of Mercury's flux ropes and reconnection fronts: MESSENGER observations, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, 121, doi:10.1002/2016JA022787.

Sundberg, T., et al. (2012), MESSENGER observations of dipolarization events in Mercury's magnetotail, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *117*, A00M03, doi:10.1029/2012JA017756.



Trávníček, P. M., P. Hellinger, D. Schriver, D. Herčík, J. A. Slavin, and B. J. Anderson (2009), Kinetic instabilities in Mercury's magnetosphere: Three-dimensional simulation results, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *36*, L07104, doi:10.1029/2008GL036630.

Tsyganenko, N. A., and D. P. Stern (1996), Modeling the global magnetic field of the large-scale Birkeland current systems, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *101*(A12), 27187–27198, doi:10.1029/96JA02735.

Volwerk, M., et al. (2013), Comparative magnetotail flapping: an overview of selected events at Earth, Jupiter and Saturn, *Ann. Geophys.*, *31*, 817–833, doi:10.5194/angeo-31-817-2013.





Wang, C.-P., L. R. Lyons, M. W. Chen, and F. R. Toffoletto (2004), Modeling the transition of the inner plasma sheet from weak to enhanced convection, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *109*, A12202, doi:10.1029/2004JA010591.

Author Manuscript







2016GL071612-f01-z-.jpg

ipt



Au

2016GL071612-f02-z-.jpg



2016GL071612-f03-z-.jpg

