

Changes in the Magnetic Field Topology and the Dayside/Nightside Reconnection Rates in Response to a Solar Wind Dynamic Pressure Front: A Case Study

A. Boudouridis^{1,2,3}, H. K. Connor⁴, D. Lummerzheim⁴, A. J. Ridley⁵, and E. Zesta⁶

¹Space Sciences Institute, Boulder, CO, USA, ²Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA, ³National Center for Environmental Information, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Boulder, CO, USA, ⁴Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, AK, USA, ⁵University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, ⁶NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA

Corresponding author: Athanasios Boudouridis (thanasis@spacescience.org)

Key Points:

- Effect of a solar wind dynamic pressure front on the open-closed polar cap boundary
- Determination of magnetic reconnection rate for a southward IMF case
- Response of the dayside/nightside reconnection rate to a solar wind dynamic pressure front

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: 10.1029/2020JA028768](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JA028768).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Abstract

One of the most significant observations associated with a sharp enhancement in solar wind dynamic pressure, P_{SW} , is the poleward expansion of the auroral oval and the closing of the polar cap. The polar cap shrinking over a wide range of magnetic local times (MLTs), in connection with an observed increase in ionospheric convection and the transpolar potential, led to the conclusion that the nightside reconnection rate is significantly enhanced after a pressure front impact. However, this enhanced tail reconnection has never been directly measured. We demonstrate the effect of a solar wind dynamic pressure front on the polar cap closure, and for the first time, measure the enhanced reconnection rate in the magnetotail, for a case occurring during southward background Interplanetary Magnetic Field (IMF) conditions. We use Polar UVI measurements to detect the location of the open-closed field line boundary, and combine them with Assimilative Mapping of Ionospheric Electrodynamics (AMIE) potentials to calculate the ionospheric electric field along the polar cap boundary, and thus evaluate the variation of the dayside/nightside reconnection rates. We find a strong response of the polar cap boundary at all available MLTs, exhibiting a significant reduction of the open flux content. We also observe an immediate response of the dayside reconnection rate, plus a phased response, delayed by ~15–20 min, of the nightside reconnection rate. Finally, we provide comparison of the observations with the results of the Open Geospace General Circulation Model (OpenGGCM), elucidating significant agreements and disagreements.

Plain Language Summary

This study provides valuable information on how the Earth's magnetosphere (the magnetized protective bubble around the Earth) is eroded by powerful explosions at the Sun. The response of the polar cap size and the reconnection rates in the magnetosphere to a solar wind high density front are investigated for an event with Interplanetary Magnetic Field orientation anti-parallel to the Earth's magnetic field. We make a data-based assessment, using Polar spacecraft ultraviolet images and assimilative model-generated potentials, plus a model-based comparison using a global magnetospheric model. An immediate response is observed at the dayside ionosphere for both the polar cap boundary and the reconnection rate mapped to the ionosphere. We also observe about 15–20 min delayed effect on various sectors of the nightside ionosphere. The comparison with the model reveals considerable discrepancies on the dayside ionosphere and significant agreements at the nightside ionosphere.

1 Introduction

Changes of the Earth's magnetic field topology drive magnetospheric activity. The dominant mechanism by which such changes are imparted on the terrestrial system and by which mass, energy, and momentum flow from the solar wind to Earth's environment is magnetic reconnection (e.g., Fuselier et al., 2011; Paschmann et al., 2013). The balance or not of reconnection rates on the dayside and nightside magnetosphere controls the field topology and the state of the system.

The Interplanetary Magnetic Field (IMF) is undeniably the most important solar wind driver of magnetic reconnection and magnetospheric activity. Its crucial role has been long documented (e.g., Akasofu, 1980; Cowley, 1984; Rich & Hairston, 1994; Boyle et al., 1997). In the past two decades, another solar wind driver has emerged as a significant contributor to activity in the terrestrial magnetosphere. Multiple studies have shown that sharp enhancements in solar

wind dynamic pressure, P_{SW} , have profound effects on the terrestrial magnetosphere-ionosphere system (e.g., Boudouridis et al., 2003; Liou, 2006). Significant changes in ionospheric convection (Boudouridis et al., 2004b, 2005, 2007, 2008a, 2011; Connor et al., 2014), auroral particle precipitation and changes in the size of the polar cap (Chua et al., 2001; Boudouridis et al., 2003, 2004a, 2005; Holmes et al., 2014), and enhancement of field-aligned currents (e.g., Zesta et al., 2000; Ozturk et al., 2018) are major effects induced by the impact of solar wind dynamic pressure fronts.

The most striking magnetospheric response to a solar wind pressure enhancement has been shown to be the shrinking of the polar cap, and therefore the decrease in the amount of the open magnetic flux in the system. This observation is particularly unexpected for cases with steady southward IMF conditions, during which the polar cap is supposed to have its greatest extent, encompassing a large amount of open flux (Zesta et al., 2000; Boudouridis et al., 2003; 2004a; 2005). The poleward motion of the polar cap boundary varies with magnetic local time (MLT), being more evident at the nightside and flanks (where it can reach up to 10° in some cases), but also occasionally present on the dayside due to a combination of highly southward IMF conditions and enhanced ionospheric convection (Boudouridis et al., 2004a). Boudouridis et al. (2003) have argued that the amount and MLT extent of the polar cap closing depends on the “preconditioning” of the magnetosphere, referring to the energy load of the magnetosphere in the time preceding the sudden compression by the solar wind pressure front. This effect was studied extensively by Boudouridis et al. (2003, 2004a, 2005) using Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) precipitating particle measurements.

Boudouridis et al. (2004a) compared the polar cap size response to pressure fronts for two event categories, strong southward IMF and near-zero IMF B_z conditions prior to the front impact time. They observed an extensive shrinking of the polar cap at a wide MLT range (well into the dayside) during the highly negative preexisting IMF B_z events. In contrast, they saw a more moderate poleward motion of the polar cap boundary, mainly confined to the nightside, when the preexisting IMF B_z was closer to zero. Boudouridis et al. (2004a) concluded that this behavior is a result of the different amount of open flux already present in the magnetotail at the time of impact, more for negative than near-zero IMF B_z conditions. The high-pressure regime compresses the magnetotail, which responds in a stronger manner when loaded with magnetic flux. Based on these observations, Boudouridis et al. (2004a) postulated that an enhancement of the tail reconnection rate is occurring shortly after the pressure front impact. The deduced enhanced tail reconnection rate is larger during periods of strong southward IMF when the magnetotail is full of stored open flux, compared to near-zero IMF B_z cases when a smaller open flux amount is present.

In addition to DMSP particle data, the shrinking of the polar cap after a solar wind pressure enhancement has also been observed in global auroral images (Lyons, 2000; Zesta et al., 2000; Milan et al., 2004; Hubert et al., 2006b, 2009; Boudouridis et al., 2008b). In all these studies the auroral oval expands poleward and intensifies while the polar cap is significantly reduced in size. The reduction is observed mostly on the nightside. Boudouridis et al. (2008b) used Polar spacecraft Ultra-Violet Imager (UVI) images to evaluate the motion of the polar cap boundary during an event with two characteristic pressure peaks. Their results show a high degree of correlation between the poleward expansion of the auroral oval, and the temporal profile of the solar wind dynamic pressure enhancement, after each pressure peak. This correlation is particularly striking in the 2–4 MLT sector, but also visible in other nightside MLT sectors.

As mentioned above, the reduction in the size of the polar cap means a reduction in the amount of the open flux in the magnetosphere. Since this is observed mostly on the nightside, it

suggests an increase in the rate of magnetotail reconnection after sudden increases in dynamic pressure (Boudouridis et al., 2003, 2004a, 2005), which implies a large-scale reconfiguration of the magnetosphere. In a study by Hubert et al. (2006b) using Super Dual Auroral Radar Network (SuperDARN) observations, the tail reconnection potential is calculated for two consecutive pressure front impacts. The tail potential increased from ~30 kV and ~20 kV before, to 132 kV and 114 kV after the pressure jump, respectively, pointing to a huge enhancement of the reconnection rate in the magnetotail. A study by Milan et al. (2004) found that the sudden compression of the magnetosphere due to a pressure front impact resulted in a decrease of the open flux content of the Northern Hemisphere from 0.5 GWb to 0.2 GWb. The pre-impact value corresponds to 7–8% of the total hemispheric flux, while the post-front value is down to only 2.5% of the total hemispheric flux, again a tremendous change signifying highly enhanced tail reconnection. The associated tail reconnection potential was estimated to be 150 kV.

The above studies show that the shrinking of the polar cap after a sudden enhancement in P_{SW} is a recurring feature, most significant during periods of strong southward IMF conditions, which makes it even more intriguing, as such reduction in open flux is not expected during these times. Based on these observations, and supportive measurements of enhancements in ionospheric convection and the transpolar potential (Boudouridis et al., 2004b, 2005, 2007, 2008a, 2011; Hubert et al., 2006b; Connor et al., 2014), it was surmised that the pressure front impact induces an enhancement of the nightside reconnection rate. However, this enhanced tail reconnection rate was never explicitly measured in the past as a function of MLT. For the first time, we present direct measurements of an enhancement in the magnetotail reconnection rate after a solar wind dynamic pressure front impact, for a case with southward IMF orientation.

2 Polar Cap Boundary Response

In this section we describe the quantitative criteria we use to identify the polar cap boundary location from Polar UVI auroral emissions. We demonstrate the use of these criteria by presenting the response of the polar cap boundary to a pressure front. Finally, we compare the UVI observed response to the response seen in the Open Geospace General Circulation Model (OpenGGCM) global magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) simulation, coupled with the Coupled Thermosphere Ionosphere Model (CTIM).

2.1 UVI polar cap boundary identification

Boudouridis et al. (2008b) have pointed out that past literature, comparing DMSP precipitating particle boundaries and Ultra-Violet (UV) emission boundaries, has supported the idea of a UV-image derived open-closed field line boundary (OCB) (Kauristie et al., 1999; Baker et al., 2000; Carbary et al., 2003). We follow the statistical study of Baker et al. (2000) who demonstrated that the poleward auroral boundary derived from Polar spacecraft UVI images is a good indicator of the location of the OCB. Their study involved comparison with the DMSP-based discrete aurora poleward boundary, believed to be the best estimate of the OCB (Newell et al., 1996). They showed that, in the evening sector, the average UVI-derived poleward auroral boundary lies only ~1° MLAT poleward of the DMSP-derived boundary. Baker et al. (2000) discussed two techniques for the identification of the OCB based on Polar UVI images, the threshold technique and the ratio technique. The first sets a constant limit of flux for the boundary, while the second one uses a constant ratio to the specific MLT sector maximum of the auroral luminosity. They went on to argue that the ratio technique, with ratios of 0.2–0.3, is the most

appropriate technique to locate the OCB, based on the DMSP discrete aurora poleward boundary comparison.

There are a few additional caveats of the Polar UVI boundary identification we need to discuss. First of all, the Polar satellite suffers from a well-known “wobble” along one of the camera axes, which rotates with the orbit precession and is thus different every year. This introduces a random uncertainty in the boundary location which Brittnacher et al. (1999) estimated to be about 1.5° . Second, the Baker et al. (2000) study used UVI data from one winter month (January 1997) when the dayglow was low. Dayglow contamination can be a serious issue during the summer months. However, Lummerzheim et al. (1997) have demonstrated that the auroral contribution in the UVI images can be extracted from the underlying dayglow even when the dayglow is the major contribution to the pixel count rate. Third, Carbary et al. (2003), based on a two-year DMSP/UVI boundary comparisons, pointed out that there are systematic errors of up to 4° in MLAT between DMSP and UVI poleward auroral boundaries, which are MLT dependent. Their maximum systematic error, however, occurs near 05 MLT, where very few DMSP orbits exist. For the rest of the oval the errors are about 1° .

2.2 OpenGGCM-CTIM modeling

The OpenGGCM-CTIM model provides a global simulation of the response of the magnetosphere-ionosphere-thermosphere system to solar wind input. The model has been used and discussed in detail in a number of studies of the solar wind-magnetosphere-ionosphere-thermosphere interaction (e.g., Raeder et al., 2001a,b; Raeder, 2006). The OpenGGCM model has been developed and continuously improved over the past two decades, and it has been extensively compared with magnetospheric and ionospheric measurements (e.g., Pulkkinen et al., 2013). Numerical details are discussed in Raeder (2003). Most relevant to this study, the OpenGGCM model has been used for studies of interplanetary shocks impacting the magnetosphere (Connor et al., 2014; Oliveira and Raeder, 2014; 2015).

The OpenGGCM is a global magnetosphere-ionosphere model that solves the resistive MHD equations with current driven instability on a non-uniform Cartesian grid (Raeder, 2003; Raeder et al., 2008). The solar wind and IMF conditions are input, and the plasma parameters and electromagnetic fields are output. Its simulation domain is $20\text{--}30 R_E$ upstream, several hundred to thousands of R_E downstream, and $\pm 40\text{--}50 R_E$ in the YZ plane. The OpenGGCM has its inner magnetosphere boundary at $2.5\text{--}3.5 R_E$ where the MHD physics is no longer applicable. OpenGGCM considers the ionosphere as a 2D plane with a fixed altitude at ~ 110 km. CTIM is a three-dimensional ionosphere-thermosphere model developed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration group (Fuller-Rowell et al., 1996). It self-consistently solves the neutral and ion dynamics with solar radiation, tidal modes, high-latitude electric fields, and aurora precipitation as inputs. Its simulation domain is from 80 km to several hundred km altitude for the thermosphere, and from 80 km to several thousand km altitude for the ionosphere, in geographic coordinates (Codrescu et al., 2012).

The OpenGGCM-CTIM couples the magnetosphere and upper atmosphere system by solving a current continuity equation (Vasyliunas, 1970; Kelley, 1989), assuming that the field-aligned currents close in the ionosphere. OpenGGCM provides field-aligned currents and aurora precipitation using the plasma parameters at the inner magnetospheric boundaries. The empirical equations of Kennel & Petcheck (1966), Knight (1973), and Lyons et al. (1979) are used to provide the mean energy and energy flux of the diffuse and discrete aurora precipitation. CTIM calculates the altitudinal profiles of aurora energy deposition, electron density, and conductivities using its

thermosphere and ionosphere parameters with the OpenGGCM aurora input. As a result, CTIM provides realistic calculation of height integrated conductance, not depending on the widely used empirical conductance model of Robinson et al. (1987), the default conductance module of the stand-alone OpenGGCM model. The OpenGGCM field-aligned currents and the CTIM conductance calculated from the OpenGGCM aurora are used to calculate ionospheric electric potentials and thus connect the field-aligned currents to the ionospheric currents. The resulting ionospheric electric fields are used to drive the upper atmosphere system in the CTIM and the plasma flow at the OpenGGCM inner magnetosphere boundary. Raeder et al. (2001b) and Connor et al. (2016) reported that the OpenGGCM-CTIM produces more realistic behavior in the ionospheric electrodynamics, and the high-latitude thermospheric mass densities during space weather events.

In this study, the OpenGGCM OCB is calculated by tracing magnetic field lines from the ionosphere through the magnetosphere to determine if they are open or closed (Connor et al., 2014). The X range of the simulation box is $[-1000, 21] R_E$, and the Y/Z ranges are $[-48, 48] R_E$, all in Geocentric Solar Ecliptic (GSE) coordinates. Field lines are traced from every point of a 3° magnetic longitude by 0.5° MLAT grid. The field line tracing stops when the total length of field line becomes $1000 R_E$. If the end point of the field line is located inside a $4 R_E$ radius in the YZ plane, the field line is closed. If this point hits the OpenGGCM's simulation box or ends up somewhere outside the $4 R_E$ radius the field line is considered open.

2.3 11 February 2000 pressure front OCB response

The left plot of Figure 1 shows the UVI polar cap boundary response for a pressure enhancement at 2356 UT on 11 February 2000. The bottom three panels plot propagated Wind spacecraft measurements of P_{SW} , IMF B_z , and IMF B_y . The solar wind/IMF data are propagated to $(17,0,0) R_E$ Geocentric Solar Magnetospheric (GSM) coordinates, using the Weimer et al. (2003)/Weimer (2004) minimum variance technique, and are given with 1-min resolution (Weygand & McPherron, 2006a; 2006b). The $17 R_E$ upstream distance is chosen because it is just outside the nominal position of the nose of the bow shock. P_{SW} jumped from 2 nPa before to 10–14 nPa after the pressure increase, where it remained for about an hour before dropping to more moderate levels of 6–10 nPa, but still elevated compared to its value before the front impact. At impact, IMF B_z changed from southward -5 nT to even more southward, initially down to -10 nT and then < -15 nT during the first hour after the pressure step, before returning to fluctuating north-south values 1 h after the P_{SW} increase. IMF B_y was also about -5 nT before, turning to -15 nT for ~ 25 min, then back to -5 nT for another 20 min, before settling to values between -10 and -15 nT for the next hour.

For our case study we use the ratio technique with a value of 0.2 of the maximum UVI intensity within 15 min wide MLT sectors. The high MLT resolution provides a detailed picture of the boundary motion after the pressure enhancement. An additional feature we employed in this identification is the subtraction of a 0.4 mW/m^2 noise level emissions prior to the application of the ratio technique.

The top panel on the left shows the evolution of the polar cap boundary MLAT for all MLTs with available data (color coded in MLAT according to the color scale on the right, white indicating missing data). We use 2 min time resolution and thus average the boundaries from all UVI images within each 2-min time bin. The boundary shows a clear response to the incoming pressure front, moving to higher MLAT values at all MLTs with good measurements before and after the pressure front impact. The closing of the polar cap is more evident at dawn (02–06 MLT)




Figure 1. (left) Polar UVI-determined polar cap boundary (color coded, top panel) as a function of time and MLAT for 11 February 2000. The bottom three panels show propagated Wind P_{SW} , IMF B_z , and IMF B_y observations. The vertical line marks the pressure front impact at 2356 UT. (right) Similar format plot of the OpenGGCM-determined polar cap boundary (notice the different MLAT color scales).

where the boundary moves from about 66° to near 80° MLAT, a tremendous change. In the early morning (06–10 MLT) the boundary moves from about 74 – 76° to in excess of 78° MLAT, while it exhibits a motion of a couple of degrees around noon, despite the sparse data available. In the near-midnight MLT region (20–02 MLT) the increase in MLAT is from 66 – 68° to 74 – 76° . The observed polar cap boundary motion occurs within 15 min of the front impact, first at the dayside and a bit later at the near-midnight region. The closing of the polar cap is quite dramatic, and it occurs despite the fact that the IMF B_z turned very southward at the same time, demonstrating clearly the strong effect of the magnetospheric compression on the amount of open flux in the system. It shows that a sudden P_{SW} enhancement can overwhelm and reverse the opening of the polar cap expected for further southward turning of the IMF.

The right plot of Figure 1 shows the OpenGGCM OCB response for the 11 February 2000 pressure front in the same format as in the UVI plot (notice the different MLAT color scales). The OpenGGCM boundary was averaged within 15 min MLT and 2 min UT bins for consistency with the UVI plot. There are differences and similarities between model and data. The model has reversed boundary locations at day and night compared with the observations before the front impact. The dayside boundary (06–18 MLT) is located around 66 – 70° , while the nightside boundary (18–06 MLT) is at ~ 72 – 80° . After impact the dayside OCB moves slightly equatorward for the first 15–20 min before moving poleward in all but the 12–17 MLT sectors. By 0040 UT the noon boundary also starts moving poleward. Later times see only a progressively narrower

afternoon region remaining at low MLAT. Even though, there are scarce observations on the dayside, the initial model OCB motion seems to contradict the UVI OCB motion, which moves slightly poleward. At the nightside, the OCB moves significantly poleward within ~20 min from the front impact, reaching higher than 84° MLAT in the post-midnight sector (00–06 MLT), and around 80–84° MLAT in the pre-midnight sector (18–24 MLT). This motion matches qualitatively the observed UVI boundary motion, albeit with much higher MLAT values.

3 Dayside/Nightside Reconnection Rate Response

We now turn our attention to the dayside and nightside reconnection rates before and after the solar wind dynamic pressure front at 2356 UT on 11 February 2000. We show reconnection rate estimations using AMIE potential results and Polar UVI OCB observations. We then compare the observation-based results with the OpenGGCM simulation results of the same event using the model-produced boundary and ionospheric potentials.

3.1 Reconnection rate determination

The AMIE technique (Richmond & Kamide, 1988) is an assimilative technique that uses least squares fitting of a variety of observations from different platforms (ground magnetometers, DMSP satellites, and SuperDARN radars), in an effort to estimate a number of ionospheric parameters, including the high-latitude potential distribution, ionospheric electric field, hemispheric power, Joule heating, etc., with resolution of up to 1 min (Lu et al., 1996, 1998; Ridley et al., 1998). For our study we use AMIE results produced only by 1-min resolution magnetometer data. Using only magnetometers as the AMIE input has certain advantages (Kihn et al., 2006): (1) magnetometers provide a continuous set of observations at a consistent spatial grid with little loss of data, something that radar and satellite measurements cannot do; (2) magnetometers are ubiquitous, offering a nearly global coverage of ionospheric electrodynamics, while satellite data provide only limited sampling of the ionosphere along the satellite orbit; and (3) no other technique can achieve the same level of continuous global coverage with 1-min resolution. AMIE uses the Fuller-Rowell & Evans (1987) model as the background conductance pattern, and then employs the Ahn et al. (1998) relationship between ground-based magnetometer perturbations and conductances.

According to Faraday's law, the local reconnection rate in the ionosphere, the amount of magnetic flux per unit length along the OCB that becomes open or closed per unit time, is equal to the component of the instantaneous ionospheric electric field at the OCB boundary, parallel to the boundary. This projection yields the convection electric field \mathbf{E}_i , which is the local reconnection rate due to plasma convection through the OCB boundary. To this we need to add the motional electric field, $\mathbf{E}_m = \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}$, which corresponds to the motion of the boundary with velocity \mathbf{v} (perpendicular to the boundary) with \mathbf{B} being the Earth's magnetic field, since we need to obtain the plasma motion on the frame of the boundary, $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_i + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}$ (e.g., Hubert et al., 2006a). The details of the reconnection rate determination are described in Appendix A.

3.2 11 February 2000 pressure front reconnection response

The results for the 11 February 2000 pressure front are shown in Figure 2. The results are obtained every 1 min. Figure 2 shows the calculations at 4 instances, (from top left) one before (2355 UT) and three after (2358, 0010, and 0017 UT) the pressure front impact at 2356 UT. At each time the dial shows the ionospheric potential (black contours) with noon at the top and dawn




Figure 2: Local reconnection rate calculation using AMIE and Polar UVI OCB at 4 instances, (from top left) before (2355 UT) and after (2358, 0010, and 0017 UT) the pressure front impact at 2356 UT on 11 February 2000. The dials show the ionospheric potential (black contours), and the reconnection electric field magnitude (color coded dots on the OCB). The plot below each dial shows the reconnection electric field as a function of MLT. The big red diamonds on the dial and the vertical dashed lines on the plot denote the extent of the dayside reconnection X-line.

on the right. The IMF was southward during this period, imposing a typical two-cell potential distribution on the ionosphere. On top of this pattern we plot the OCB obtained from Polar UVI

images, and the magnitude of the reconnection electric field (in mV/m), convection plus motional (color coded dots on the OCB). The plot below each dial shows the reconnection electric field as a function of MLT, convection (blue), motional (green), and total (red). The big red diamonds on the dial and the vertical dashed lines on the plot denote the extent of the projection of the dayside reconnection X-line on the ionosphere (see Appendix A for its definition). Between each dial and its associated plot we provide information on the polar cap area in R_E^2 , the maximum rate in mV/m, and the total rate or reconnection potential in kV along the dayside (defined by the X-line limits) and the nightside (the remaining OCB).

In the pre-front frame (top left) the dayside and nightside reconnection rates are both below 20 mV/m, with reconnection potentials of about 30 kV. The maximum dayside rate appears near noon, while the maximum nightside rate is located in the post-midnight region. The potential has a two-cell pattern and X-line projection in the ionosphere spans about 10 h of MLT. The polar cap extends to $\sim 75^\circ$ on the dayside and below 70° on the nightside with area of $0.35 R_E^2$. In the first postfront frame (top right), 2 min after the sudden increase in pressure, the potential has been enhanced on the dayside leading to a considerable rise in the dayside reconnection rate that now reaches nearly 65 mV/m and 93.6 kV across a much tighter X-line. The nightside rate has also increased to above 35 mV/m maximum value at post-midnight MLTs, and 64.4 kV overall along the nightside portion of the OCB. The polar cap area is still unchanged at this point. In the next two frames (bottom) the potential continues to intensify, especially on the dawn (positive) side, preserving a significantly enhanced dayside reconnection rate. By now, however, the nightside reconnection rate has significantly increased, with the nightside reconnection potential already overtaking the dayside one. At 0010 UT on 12 February 2000 (bottom left) the nightside rate exhibits three enhancements along the nightside OCB with the maximum rate at 06–07 MLT due to the very distorted nature of the convection pattern. By 0017 UT (bottom right) the maximum has shifted to the 02 MLT region. The polar cap area in the last two frames has started to decrease as the polar cap boundary on the nightside moves poleward, measuring $0.29 R_E^2$ at 0010 UT and $0.23 R_E^2$ at 0017 UT.

3.3 Reconnection evolution after the pressure front

The reconnection rate calculation of the previous section is fully automated, given the AMIE potential pattern and the Polar UVI polar cap boundary, and as long as a two-cell convection pattern is present which is the case for southward to slightly northward IMF conditions. This allows us to examine the evolution of the dayside/nightside reconnection rates after a dynamic pressure enhancement with 1-min resolution.

Figure 3 illustrates the reconnection evolution with time, on the left based on the AMIE/UVI observations and on the right based on the OpenGGCM simulation. The left plot shows a summary of the reconnection results for the period of 2300 UT on 11 February 2000 to 0100 UT on the next day. The top panel shows the total reconnection electric field (convection plus motional) in mV/m, taken from the 1-min resolution plots of Figure 2, color coded according to the scale on the right. The two white lines cutting along the time axis mark the limits of the dayside reconnection X-line. The middle panel shows the estimated dayside (red) and nightside (blue) total rates (or reconnection potentials) in kV. The bottom panel shows the polar cap area, i.e., the area of open flux in the system. The vertical lines at 2356 UT mark the pressure front impact time. For this event the dayside UVI OCB is only sparsely observed after 0020 UT on 12 February (see Figure 1). In this case the OCB on the dayside is heavily interpolated in order to produce the




Figure 3. (left) AMIE/UVI-determined local reconnection rate (color coded, top panel) as a function of time and MLT for the event of 11 February 2000. The two white lines demarcate the extent of the dayside X-line. The middle panel shows the dayside/nightside reconnection potentials. The bottom panel shows the polar cap area. The vertical lines at 2356 UT mark the pressure front impact time. (right) The same quantities derived using the OpenGGCM-determined polar cap boundary and potential distribution.

reconnection rates, and thus the calculations are unreliable after 0020 UT. This is denoted by the dashed dayside total rate and polar cap area in the bottom two panels.

The reconnection summary plot shows clearly the response of the dayside and nightside reconnection rates to the incoming pressure front. Before 2356 UT both the dayside and nightside local rates are below 20 mV/m, with the reconnection potentials below 50 kV. At impact there is an immediate and impressive enhancement of the dayside local rate by a factor of about 3–4. This remains unchanged throughout the interval of the plot, even though as mentioned earlier it becomes unreliable after 0020 UT. At the nightside there is an immediate response near midnight by a factor of 2–3 (as was shown in the top right plot of Figure 2). This, however, subsides quickly to be replaced by enhanced reconnection in the 05–08 MLT region that lasts for ~25 min. During the first 10 min on 12 February this is the dominant reconnection region on the nightside. Eventually, after 0015 UT, the post-midnight region becomes the dominant site of the enhanced nightside reconnection, which lasts for about 45 min after.

The reconnection potentials of the middle panel show the strong response of the total rates. Both dayside and nightside potentials rise soon after the front arrival, the nightside exhibiting a stronger response. However, the dayside rate remains steady throughout, while the nightside rate has a peak about 20 min after the front impact and subsides within an hour from impact. Finally,

the bottom panel shows quantitatively the previously observed reduction of the magnetospheric open flux after the pressure increase (Figure 1).

The right plot of Figure 3 shows the same quantities as in the left plot, calculated using potential patterns and OCBs produced by the OpenGGCM MHD model. The local reconnection rates of the top panel show a substantial increase after the increase in solar wind pressure, both on the dayside and the nightside. However, the magnitudes and time scales of these changes are different from the observed changes. The dayside rate increases by a factor of 2 in the first 10 min after the pressure front, and gradually decreases during the next 40 min. The post-midnight rates increase by about 50% 15 min after the pressure increase and last at this level for ~20 min. There is also some increase in the 5–8MLT sector but much lower than in the data. The pre-midnight rate enhancement is of similar magnitude with the data, but exhibiting different UT-MLT structure.

Even though, the model dayside reconnection rates are at a lower level compared with the data ones, the extent of the dayside X-line in the model is greater, leading to slightly higher dayside model rates as seen in the middle panel. In the first 10 min this is also higher than the nightside model potential. The situation, however, reverses in the next 20 min as the postmidnight reconnection rate picks up. The polar cap area of the bottom panel reflects the evolution of the OCB seen in the model plot of Figure 1. It first rises for ~10 min before it drops to values lower than before the pressure front in another 15 min. This is also in agreement with the reconnection potentials of the middle panel, rising when the dayside rate is higher and dropping once the nightside rate dominates. It is different, however, from the data evolution of the polar cap area which continuously decreases due to the higher nightside rate after the pressure enhancement.

4 Discussion

4.1 Connection to previous studies

The event we presented shows the significant effect solar wind dynamic pressure fronts can have on the polar cap boundary and the dayside/nightside reconnection rates. This response is in agreement with prior results on the effects of dynamic pressure fronts (Boudouridis et al., 2003; 2004a; 2005; 2007; 2008a; 2008b; 2011; Hubert et al., 2009; Connor et al., 2014). The behavior of the dayside/nightside reconnection potentials was predicted by Boudouridis et al. (2008a), who examined the DMSP-measured and AMIE-produced transpolar potential after a pressure front on 30 April 1998. Both datasets showed an initial increase of the potential which reaches a peak before it fades away leaving a residual value higher than the pre-front potential. Boudouridis et al. (2008a) attributed the high post-front peak to enhanced nightside reconnection that soon fades away, and the residual potential to enhanced dayside reconnection under the continued compression of the magnetosphere by the enhanced solar wind dynamic pressure. The present results quantitatively confirm their conclusions.

This interpretation builds on previous results on the responses of the ionospheric convection and the polar cap boundary after sudden P_{SW} enhancements. Boudouridis et al. (2004a) studied the differences in the closing of the polar cap after pressure fronts during different concurrent IMF conditions. They concluded that the more extensive closing during southward IMF is due to the compression of a magnetotail loaded with magnetic flux. When the tail is compressed, tail reconnection occurs along the entire width of the tail, producing the nightside and flank polar cap closing and the high nightside reconnection potential. However, when the tail reaches a new equilibrium under the new P_{SW} , the nightside reconnection subsides. On the dayside, Boudouridis et al. (2007) showed that the abrupt increase in dynamic pressure leads to SuperDARN-observed

convection enhancements at the apparent location of the cusp. The response is almost immediate, and reaches maximum magnitude within 4 min of impact. The variation of the dynamic pressure has excellent correlation with the variation of the enhanced convection, leading Boudouridis et al. (2007) to conclude that enhanced dynamic pressure results in a sustained dayside reconnection enhancement.

Boudouridis et al. (2008b) used quantitative estimates of the OCB inferred from Polar UVI images (in a method similar to the one used here) and SuperDARN flow measurements to witness ionospheric flow enhancements in the nightside that cross the polar cap boundary following an increase in dynamic pressure, signifying an enhancement in tail reconnection. The onset of the observed reconnection rate response is consistent with the statistical SuperDARN flow response after pressure fronts described by Boudouridis et al. (2011). They showed that the dayside flows react immediately but the nightside flows are delayed by 10–15 min, and attributed this behavior to corresponding enhancements of the dayside and nightside reconnection rates. This same responses are observed in the left panel of Figure 3.

4.2 Potential tail reconnection initiation mechanisms

Changes in the plasma sheet plasma and magnetic field states in response to IMF B_z direction changes are gradual (of the order of hours) even when the IMF changes are sharp (Terasawa et al., 1997; Wang et al., 2010). In contrast, the plasma sheet plasma pressure is highly correlated with the solar wind dynamic pressure (e.g., Borovsky et al., 1998; Wang et al., 2013). In addition, the changes in plasma pressure and the corresponding magnetic field configurations everywhere in the near-Earth plasma sheet are within a few minutes after the impact of a P_{sw} enhancement on the magnetosphere (Miyashita et al., 2010; Shi et al., 2013; Yue et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2013). The question that arises now is “what is the physical mechanism for the initiation of the enhanced tail reconnection after a solar wind dynamic pressure front impact?” This question can be addressed in a way similar to the substorm triggering question (e.g., Akasofu, 2017; Mishin et al., 2017; Ebihara, 2019, and references therein). The two main mechanisms discussed in literature in this context are the Earth-ionosphere waveguide (e.g., Araki, 1977; Kikuchi and Araki, 1979; 2002, Lyons et al., 2013), and the compressional wave propagation through the magnetosphere (e.g., Chi et al., 2001; 2002). In the first mechanism the pressure front first affects the ionosphere, then the disturbance propagates into the tail and triggers reconnection. In the second mechanism the pressure front launches a compressional wave into the magnetosphere, which focuses a large amount of Poynting flux onto the plasma sheet, and triggers reconnection.

The “dripping, tilting bucket” model put forward by Zhou and Tsurutani [2002], outlines the scenarios under which a pressure front facilitates the release of the energy stored in the magnetotail under different preexisting IMF conditions, producing a substorm, pseudo-breakup, or no response at all. According to this model, sustained southward preexisting IMF conditions load the magnetotail with energy. The compression of the magnetotail after a pressure front lowers the threshold for the occurrence of a substorm, further linking the mechanisms responsible for triggering the enhanced tail reconnection during pressure fronts and substorms. This link was further investigated by Lyons et al. (2005), who argued that auroral brightness enhancements after a pressure front impact can be due to a compressive energization of the plasma sheet, a substorm, or both, depending on the interplay of the solar wind pressure enhancement, the preexisting IMF conditions, as well as any concurrent changes in the IMF at the time of impact.

Using multiple Time History of Events and Macroscale Interactions during Substorms (THEMIS) probes to study an interplanetary shock event, Zhou et al. (2013) showed that just a

few minutes after the pressure front hit the subsolar magnetopause, the tail current sheet thickness started to decrease, reconnection rate started to increase, and earthward flows started to enhance, signifying a sharp change in the tail structure. They separated the tail effects in two parts. The first response was due to the launch of a compressional wave into the magnetosphere when the shock impinged the subsolar magnetopause. The compressional wave travelled at the magnetosonic speed of 2900 km/s and reached the tail current sheet within a minute, when the THEMIS spacecraft began to record changes in the tail structure. The second part of the response was due to the arrival of the external shock compression at the THEMIS X location downtail, which propagated in the solar wind with speed of 550 km/s, and compressed the magnetosphere along the way. This reached the THEMIS probes 3–4 min after the compressional wave.

The nightside reconnection evolution seen near midnight MLT of the left plot of Figure 3 has some of the characteristics described by Zhou et al. (2013). The first reconnection enhancement occurs almost instantaneously, even though of small magnitude (~ 30 mV/m), and lasts for 5 min. This can be the result of the arrival of the compressional wave, which according to Zhou et al. (2013) causes local magnetic field and plasma fluctuations. The second reconnection enhancement is initiated ~ 5 min after the end of the first one (~ 0005 UT), is further enhanced 10 min after that (0015 UT), and reached its peak another 20 min later (0035 UT). The further enhancement at 0015 UT appears to be due to the increased compression of the tail by the arrival of the main pressure front at the downtail location. The peak enhancement at ~ 0035 UT is perhaps due to an additional peak in the solar wind dynamic pressure, coinciding with further southward turning of the IMF. It is obvious that more events are needed to clearly establish the proper sequence of events in the tail after a solar wind pressure front impact, and determine the reconnection initiation mechanism. Local measurements in the tail, plus modeling of the local tail response will also be greatly beneficial in delineating the physical mechanisms involved.

4.3 Additional discussion on caveats

The technique used for the reconnection rate calculation is not specific to the dynamic pressure effects study. It can be used widely for any problem that involves reconnection estimation in magnetospheric physics, as it already has (e. g., Hubert et al., 2006a, and references therein). There are, however, challenges in the effort to obtain the reconnection rate, as was discussed throughout this article.

It is worth repeating that the most serious challenge is the quality of the OCB determination. In section 2.1 we discussed the various caveats related to the accuracy of the Polar UVI OCB location determination, and justification for its use. Even though multiple previous studies have demonstrated the ability of polar images in pinpointing this boundary, the boundary resulting from the UVI image processing is not always smooth, or complete for that matter. Even when the imager has full view of the polar ionosphere there are still gaps and irregularities in the boundary determination. An important ensuing issue is the smoothness of the motion of the boundary. This can have a serious effect on the reconnection rate determination, as sudden movements of the boundary from frame to frame (perhaps due to inaccurate identification) will register as strong (but spurious) changes in the reconnection rate, resulting in overestimates of the rate or even strongly negative reconnection rates. To minimize these effects we first remove any point along the determined OCB that is one standard deviation in MLAT away from its neighbors. We then average all the boundaries within 3 min around each AMIE frame (1 min before, 1 min after, and the current minute). Considering that the UVI images have up to 37 s resolution, this interval can include up to 4 images. The resulting boundary is then interpolated on missing MLT

sectors and smoothed in MLT. The poleward or equatorward boundary velocity at each MLT is determined using a 3-point Lagrangian interpolation.

Another issue of the dayside reconnection rate determination is the fact that the cusp aurora appears on open instead of closed field lines, leading to a false identification of the poleward auroral boundary with the OCB. However, Hubert et al. (2006a) have shown that this introduces only a minimal error in the reconnection rate calculation, in the range of 5–10% when the convection electric field is strong and 10–20% when the motional electric field is dominant. One way to mitigate this is to compare the Polar UVI cusp boundary location against publicly available DMSP boundary determinations, which is left for future work.

4.4 Comparison with OpenGGCM results, past and present

As was reported in sections 2 and 3, the OpenGGCM model has mixed success in reproducing the observations. With the exception of the dayside closing of the polar cap, the model has simulated the salient features of the pressure front response sufficiently well. Both data and model see the nightside and early morning closing of the polar cap. The magnitude of the closing is much higher in the model, as is evident by the different color scales of Figure 1, but the timescales of the response are similar, both within 15–20 min from the front impact. Similarly, the model shows qualitative agreement with the observations when it comes to the reconnection rate response. The simulation records the immediate increase of the dayside reconnection rate, and the pre- and post-midnight enhancements with a delay of 15–20 min. The magnitude of the model response is, however, much more subdued in comparison with the data that witness a tremendous change in the local reconnection rate.

It is worth mentioning here that the model pre-front location of the OCB is reversed compared to the data, exhibiting a lower MLAT location on the dayside and higher MLAT location on the nightside, which is the opposite of what is seen in the UVI measurements. The effect on the post-front response of the model OCB is clear from Figure 1, resulting in much higher nightside post-front values compared to the data, and completely different picture on the dayside. Why this is the state of the pre-front model OCB location, and what effect this might have on the model reconnection rate estimation remains to be investigated with more events in the future.

Connor et al. (2014) used the OpenGGCM-CTIM to study the effects of solar wind dynamic pressure fronts on the transpolar potential and the dayside/nightside reconnection rates. For a pressure step increase event at 0925 UT on 30 April 1998 (that was previously studied by Boudouridis et al. (2004a, 2008a)), they calculated the model transpolar potential, dayside and nightside reconnection rates. They compared the model transpolar potential to DMSP-derived and AMIE-derived observations. They found significant agreement between the model and the observations. Both OpenGGCM-CTIM and DMSP track an initial potential increase after the sudden enhancement in dynamic pressure. Despite the fact that the dynamic pressure remains high both model and measurements show a subsequent decrease of the transpolar potential. AMIE results qualitatively agree with this response albeit anticipating lower potential magnitude overall. The simulation also estimates the dayside and nightside reconnection rates. It shows that the dayside reconnection rate experiences a dramatic increase within 10 min of the dynamic pressure jump. It then slowly fades away during the next 3 h. The nightside reconnection rate demonstrates a more variable behavior which includes three consecutive pressure peaks, the first of which manifests ~15 min after the dayside reconnection enhancement.

Our results show qualitative agreement with the Connor et al. (2014) study. More rigorous evaluation of the model response for more events is needed to explore the discrepancies of the

data/model reconnection rate and OCB motion, and identify the model parameters that will bridge the gap with the data.

5 Summary and Conclusions

The main conclusion of this study is the direct measurement of the enhanced nightside reconnection rate after the impact of a solar wind dynamic pressure front. This nightside reconnection enhancement was only postulated in the past, based on the closing of the polar cap and enhancement of ionospheric convection, but was never directly measured. For the first time, we performed this calculation using the combined Polar UVI/AMIE datasets, and proved that a significant increase in tail reconnection occurs in connection with the impact of a solar wind pressure front. The tail reconnection enhancement, as seen in the nightside reconnection potential (left middle panel of Figure 3), peaks in about 20 min after the pressure front impact, after which time it slowly subsides. We suggest that the 20 min timescale is the time it takes for the magnetotail to reconfigure itself after the sudden compression from the increased P_{SW} regime. The tail is now balanced at a new external compression level, thus not supporting further reconnection rate enhancements.

A more detailed account of the conclusions reached with respect to the UVI/AMIE observations of this study is as follows:

1. The polar cap size is reduced after a pressure front impact. The reduction is more evident on the nightside but also present on the dayside.
2. The response of the OCB motion is nearly immediate on the dayside and early morning MLT sectors, reaching maximum displacement in 10–20 min. The midnight region's response is initiated ~10 min from impact, and reach maximum effect in another ~10 min.
3. In terms of the reconnection rate, the data demonstrate a strong response on both the dayside and the nightside magnetosphere, with rates rising considerably from pre-front values. The nightside effects are most significant first in the 5–8 MLT sector and then in the postmidnight MLT sector. The details of the MLT distribution of the nightside reconnection rate might be dependent on the specific event characteristics (solar wind properties, polar region potentials, and polar cap boundary), but the total nightside reconnection rate exhibits a clear pressure-front related enhancement.
4. As with the OCB, the dayside response is immediate after the arrival of the pressure front. The 5–8 MLT sector reacts 5 min after impact, while the main postmidnight response is first witnessed within ~20 min after the pressure jump.

The above conclusions stem from this particular study. The closing of the polar cap has been observed in other events, but the MLT/time delay details might differ from case to case. The reconnection rate changes recorded in this case are novel observations, but we strongly believe the most salient features are applicable to other pressure front events under southward IMF conditions.

The study also utilized the OpenGGCM global MHD model for comparison with the UVI/AMIE observations. The comparison has revealed several agreements and disagreements with the data. The following are its key points:

1. The OpenGGCM model simulations of the OCB agree qualitatively with the data on the nightside and morning MLT sectors. The timescales of the model response are similar to the data in these sectors. The magnitude of the model response is, however, much stronger.

Table 1. Summary of the Open-Closed Boundary results.

MLT Range (hours)	Open-Closed Boundary			
	Observations		OpenGGCM	
	MLAT	Time delay	MLAT	Time delay
00-01	66°–68° to	15 min	74°–80° to >84°	20 min
01-02	74°–76°			
02-03	66° to 80°	4 min to 74° 20 min to 80°		
03-04				
04-05				
05-06				
06-07	74°–76° to >78°	10 min to 77° 20 min to >78°	68°–70° to 76°–84°	20 min
07-08				
08-09				
09-10				
10-11	75° to 76°	2 min	66°–68° to 70°–74°	40 min
11-12				
12-13			66°–68° to 64°–66°	2–4 min
13-14				
14-15	No reliable data	No reliable data	68°–70° to 66°–68°	4–8 min
15-16				
16-17				
17-18				
18-19				
19-20	66°–68° to 74°–76°	15 min	72°–74° to >82°	20 min
20-21				
21-22				
22-23				
23-24				

2. The model noon-to-afternoon response is opposite of that of the data, showing a slight opening of the polar cap in these MLT sectors, at least during the first hour after impact.
3. The pre-front model assessment of the OCB is reversed in comparison with the data, showing that the OCB's initial location was at low MLAT at dayside and high MLAT at nightside.
4. The OpenGGCM model reconnection rates increase with timescales similar to the observations, but exhibit much reduced post-front magnitude, and shorter duration for the ensuing enhanced reconnection.

We should mention that the comparison with the model was meant to showcase that the particular model with its current setup cannot entirely simulate the pressure front response in terms of the polar cap boundary motion and reconnection rates estimate. The purpose of the side-by-side comparison was not to determine the faults of the model that lead to its inaccurate assessment of this case, but to provide a starting point for future work by the modelers in an effort to improve the model, so that sharp changes in solar wind dynamic pressure can be more correctly

Table 2. Summary of the Reconnection Rate results.

MLT Range (hours)	Reconnection Rate				
	Observations		OpenGGCM		
	Magnitude	Time delay	Magnitude	Time delay	
00-01	<10 mV/m to 25 mV/m then to >40 mV/m	2 min initially 20 min main response	<20 mV/m to 25–35 mV/m	12 min	
01-02					
02-03					
03-04					
04-05	No response	No response			
05-06	10 mV/m to 20–40 mV/m	5 min	No significant response	No significant response	
06-07					
07-08					
08-09	No significant response	No significant response			
09-10					
10-11	10–20 mV/m to >50 mV/m	2 min	20 mV/m to 30–40 mV/m	2 min	
11-12					
12-13					
13-14					
14-15	No significant response	No significant response	No significant response	No significant response	
15-16					
16-17					
17-18					
18-19			<10 mV/m to 20–30 mV/m	20 min	2–4 min initially at 18–21 MLT 20 min main response
19-20					
20-21					
21-22					
22-23	10–15 mV/m to 25 mV/m	20 min			
23-24					

incorporated in the model simulation of the magnetosphere. Even though the OpenGGCM-CTIM can realistically describe the ionospheric electrodynamics during space weather events (as mentioned in section 2.2), it still cannot accurately account for the OCB and reconnection rate changes during pressure front events.

The results of the study in terms of both magnitude of the response and response time, observations and modeling, are comprehensively outlined in Tables 1 and 2, for the OCB and reconnection rates, respectively. This is a rough depiction of the understanding of Figures 1 and 3, which should be consulted for a more detailed picture of the responses.

Finally, the reconnection rate calculation used in this study is fully automated, given the AMIE potential pattern and the Polar UVI polar cap boundary location. The only other limitation is that the accurate dayside reconnection X-line length determination requires a potential distribution that resembles a two-cell convection pattern. This requirement is necessary for the estimation of the dayside/nightside reconnection potentials. Therefore, the described technique




Figure A1. Steps in the determination of the reconnection rate from ionospheric measurements (example for 2357 UT on 11 February 2000): (a) AMIE ionospheric potential distribution, (b) 2-d ionospheric electric field, (c) ionospheric electric field vectors interpolated on the OCB location, and (d) determination of the extent of the X-line based on the potential distribution and the UVI OCB location.

works for southward or slightly northward IMF conditions. We should emphasize again that the described technique can be used widely for any problem that involves reconnection estimation in magnetospheric physics, beyond the narrow scope of the present study of the effects of solar wind dynamic pressure fronts.

Appendix A: Reconnection rate calculations

We begin with the potential distribution in the ionosphere deduced by AMIE. The AMIE potentials are provided at 24 MLT sectors and every 2° MLAT from the pole to 44° . Figure A1 panel (a) shows the potential distribution at 2357 UT on 11 February 2000, as contours color-coded with the scale on the right of the dial. Noon is at the top and dusk on the left for all four panels of Figure A1, with MLAT circles limited between 60° and 90° . In this color scheme the




Figure A2. Final steps in the reconnection rate calculation for 2357 UT on 11 February 2000. (left) The OCB electric field component parallel to the boundary is the convection electric field, shown in the panel below the dial. (right) The total electric field, convection plus motional (red in the panel below the dial), yields the reconnection rate along the OCB. The format of the two plots is the same as in Figure 2.

zero potential curve is green and separates the positive potentials (yellow to red) from the negative potentials (cyan to blue).

The electric field distribution over the same region is obtained by differentiating the potential in two directions, eastward and poleward, since $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla\Phi$. Figure A1 panel (b) shows the total vector ionospheric electric field distribution on the same regular grid as the potential distribution of panel (a). The location of each electric field vector is marked by a dot, with its direction indicated by a line, the length of which is proportional to the magnitude of the total field (according to the arrow at the bottom left of the dial), and color-coded with the scale on the right.

The two electric field components are then estimated for the OCB MLT/MLAT location determinations by interpolating the given regular grid values, thus providing the total electric field vector on the boundary location. Figure A1 panel (c) shows the interpolated total electric field vectors on the OCB boundary, which was determined with the technique described in section 2. The arrow length and color of the field follow the conventions established for panel (b).

Finally, Figure A1 panel (d) illustrates the technique for determining the length of the projection of the dayside X-line on the ionosphere. The dayside X-line is the line along the dayside magnetosphere where field line reconnection occurs. The calculation of the dayside/nightside reconnection potentials of Figures 2 and 3 depend on the accurate determination of the dayside X-line extent. In panel (d) we plot again the AMIE potentials in the same format as in panel (a), and overplot the UVI OCB color-coded with the local potential value. The projection of the dayside X-line is defined as the boundary portion through which the ionospheric plasma flows anti-

sunward (into the polar cap). This definition assumes southward IMF conditions and a two-cell convection pattern.

We proceed by first identifying the point on the dayside OCB where the zero potential contour intersects the boundary (big brown diamond). We then move on both dawnward and duskward directions looking for the points where the potential slope changes sign for the first time. At the dawn side this will be from positive to negative, and the opposite for the dusk side (big red diamonds). The portion of the dayside boundary between these two points is the dayside reconnection X-line projection on the ionosphere. There are some technical issues with this identification. First, when the IMF is strongly in the dawn-dusk direction, the two-cell pattern is so distorted that the accurate identification of the zero potential curve on the dayside with automated techniques becomes problematic. Another issue arises when the boundary is at low latitudes (or the two-cell pattern is at higher latitudes). In this case following the boundary on either dusk or dawn (or both) can proceed parallel to the equipotential lines, leading to an unrealistically long dayside X-line, occasionally reaching deep into the nightside.

The final steps in the reconnection rate calculation for 2357 UT on 11 February 2000 are illustrated in Figure A2. The component of the OCB vector electric field of panel (c) in the direction parallel to the boundary in each 15-min MLT sector yields the convection electric field E_i . This represents the reconnection rate due to plasma convection through the boundary. The left plot of Figure A2 shows the convection electric field vectors parallel to the OCB (visible only on the dayside at this magnitude), color-coded with scale on the right, and plotted as function of MLT at the panel below the dial.

An additional component of the reconnection rate is due to the motional electric field, $E_m = \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}$, which corresponds to the motion of the boundary with velocity v (perpendicular to the boundary), where B is the Earth's magnetic field. This is necessary to obtain the plasma motion on the frame of the boundary, $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_i + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}$ (Siscoe & Huang, 1985; Hubert et al., 2006a). The total reconnection rate is shown in the right plot of Figure A2, color-coded in the same manner, and plotted in red as function of MLT in the panel below the dial.

Acknowledgments, Samples, and Data

We are grateful to Chih-Ping Wang of the University of California at Los Angeles, and Joachim Raeder of the University of New Hampshire for useful discussions. The work by Athanasios Boudouridis at the Space Science Institute (SSI) was supported by NASA Geospace Sciences award NNX11AJ07G. Hyunju K. Connor gratefully acknowledges support from NSF grants OIA-1920965 and AGS-1928883, and NASA grants 80NSSC19K0844, 80NSSC18K104 and 80NSSC18K1052. We wish to thank James Weygand of the University of California at Los Angeles for the propagated solar wind and IMF data which can be found at <http://vmo.igpp.ucla.edu/data1/Weygand/>. The polar UVI data can be found at the CDAWeb website <https://cdaweb.gsfc.nasa.gov/index.html/>. The AMIE results can be found at http://vmr.engin.umich.edu/Model/_amie/plot.php. The OpenGGCM model can be run at the Community Coordinated Modeling Center website <https://ccmc.gsfc.nasa.gov/index.php>.

References

Ahn, B.-H., Richmond, A. D., Kamide, Y., Kroehl, H. W., Emery, B. A., de la Beaujardi re, O., & Akasofu, S.-I. (1998). An ionospheric conductance model based on ground magnetic disturbance data. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *103*, 14,769–14,780.

- Akasofu, S.-I. (1980). The solar wind-magnetosphere energy coupling and magnetospheric disturbances. *Planet. Space Sci.*, 28, 495–509.
- Akasofu, S.-I. (2017). Auroral substorms: Search for processes causing the expansion phase in terms of the electric current approach. *Space Sci. Rev.*, 212, 341–381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-017-0363-7>
- Araki, T., (1977). Global structure of geomagnetic sudden commencements. *Planet. Space Sci.*, 25, 373–384.
- Baker, J. B., Clauer, C. R., Ridley, A. J., Papitashvili, V. O., Brittnacher, M. J., & Newell, P. T. (2000). The nightside poleward boundary of the auroral oval as seen by DMSP and the Ultraviolet Imager. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(A9), 21,267–21,280.
- Borovsky, J. E., Thomsen, M. F., & Elphic, R. C. (1998). The driving of the plasma sheet by the solar wind. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103(A8), 17,617–17,640.
- Boudouridis, A., Zesta, E., Lyons, L. R., Anderson, P. C., & Lummerzheim, D. (2003). Effect of solar wind pressure pulses on the size and strength of the auroral oval. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(A4), 8012. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JA009373>
- Boudouridis, A., Zesta, E., Lyons, L. R., Anderson, P. C., & Lummerzheim, D. (2004a). Magnetospheric reconnection driven by solar wind pressure fronts. *Ann. Geophys.*, 22, 1367–1378.
- Boudouridis, A., Zesta, E., Lyons, L. R., & Anderson, P. C. (2004b). Evaluation of the Hill-Siscoe transpolar potential saturation model during a solar wind dynamic pressure pulse. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31, L23802. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004GL021252>
- Boudouridis, A., Zesta, E., Lyons, L. R., Anderson, P. C., & Lummerzheim, D. (2005). Enhanced solar wind geoeffectiveness after a sudden increase in dynamic pressure during southward IMF orientation. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, A05214. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JA010704>
- Boudouridis, A., Lyons, L. R., Zesta, E., & Ruohoniemi, J. M. (2007). Dayside reconnection enhancement resulting from a solar wind dynamic pressure increase. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, A06201. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JA012141>
- Boudouridis, A., Zesta, E., Lyons, L. R., Anderson, P. C., & Ridley, A. J. (2008a). Temporal evolution of the transpolar potential after a sharp enhancement in solar wind dynamic pressure. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, L02101. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL031766>
- Boudouridis, A., Lyons, L. R., Zesta, E., Ruohoniemi, J. M., & Lummerzheim, D. (2008b). Nightside flow enhancement associated with solar wind dynamic pressure driven reconnection. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, A12211. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JA013489>
- Boudouridis, A., Lyons, L. R., Zesta, E., Weygand, J. M., Ribeiro, A. J., & Ruohoniemi, J. M. (2011). Statistical study of the effect of solar wind dynamic pressure fronts on the dayside and nightside ionospheric convection. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, A10233. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JA016582>
- Boyle, C. B., Reiff, P. H., & Hairston, M. R. (1997). Empirical polar cap potentials. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102(A1), 111–125. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96JA01742>
- Brittnacher, M., Fillingim, M., Parks, G., Germany, G., & Spann, J. (1999). Polar cap area and boundary motion during substorms. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104(A6), 12,251–12,262. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1998JA900097>
- Carbary, J. F., Sotirelis, T., Newell, P. T., & Meng, C.-I. (2003). Auroral boundary correlations between UVI and DMSP. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(A1), 1018. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JA009378>

- Chi, P. J., et al. (2001). Propagation of the preliminary reverse impulse of sudden commencements to low latitudes. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *106*, 18,857–18,864.
- Chi, P. J., et al. (2002). Reply to comment by T. Kikuchi and T. Araki on “Propagation of the preliminary reverse impulse of sudden commencements to low latitudes”. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *107*(A12), 1474, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JA009369>
- Chua, D., Parks, G., Brittnacher, M., Germany, G., & Spann, J. (2001). Energy characteristics of auroral electron precipitation: A comparison of substorms and pressure pulse related auroral activity. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *106*, 5945–5956.
- Codrescu, M. V., Negrea, C., Fedrizzi, M., Fuller-Rowell, T. J., Dobin, A., Jakowsky, N., Khalsa, H., Matsuo, T., & Maruyama, N. (2012). A real-time run of the Coupled Thermosphere Ionosphere Plasmasphere Electrodynamics (CTIPE) model, *Space Weather*, *10*, S02001, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011SW000736>
- Connor, H. K., Zesta, E., Ober, D. M., & Raeder, J. (2014). The relation between transpolar potential and reconnection rates during sudden enhancement of solar wind dynamic pressure: OpenGGCM-CTIM results. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *119*, 3411–3429. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JA019728>
- Connor, H. K., Zesta, E., Fedrizzi, M., Shi, Y., Raeder, J., Codrescu, M. V., & Fuller-Rowell, T. J. (2016). Modeling the ionosphere-thermosphere response to a geomagnetic storm using physics-based magnetospheric energy input: OpenGGCM-CTIM results. *J. Space Weather Space Clim.*, *6*, A25. <https://doi.org/10.1051/swsc/2016019>
- Cowley, S. W. H. (1984). Solar wind control of magnetospheric convection. In *Achievements of the International Magnetospheric Study (IMS)*, edited by B. Battrick and E. Rolfe, pp. 483–494, European Space Agency, Noordwijk, Netherlands.
- Ebihara, Y. (2019). Simulation study of near-Earth space disturbances: 2. Auroral substorms. *Progress in Earth and Planetary Science*, *6*:24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40645-019-0273-2>
- Fuller-Rowell, T., & Evans, D. (1987). Height-integrated Pedersen and Hall conductivity patterns inferred from TIROS–NOAA satellite data. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *92*, 7606–7618. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JA092iA07p07606>
- Fuller-Rowell, T. J., Rees, D., Quegan, S., Moffett, R. J., Codrescu, M. V., & Millward, G. H. (1996). A coupled thermosphere-ionosphere model (CTIM). *STEP Report*, R. W. Schunk, NOAA/NGDC, Boulder, Colorado, 217.
- Fuselier, S. A., & Lewis, W. S. (2011). Properties of near-Earth magnetic reconnection from in-situ observations. *Space Sci. Rev.*, *160*, 95–121. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-011-9820-x>
- Holmes, J. M., Johnsen, M. G., Deehr, C. S., Zhou, X.-Y., & Lorentzen, D. A. (2014). Circumpolar ground-based optical measurements of proton and electron shock aurora. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *119*, 3895–3914. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JA019574>
- Hubert, B., Milan, S. E., Grocott, A., Cowley, S. W. H., & Gérard, J.-C. (2006a). Dayside and nightside reconnection rates inferred from IMAGE-FUV and SuperDARN data. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *111*, A03217. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JA011140>
- Hubert, B., Palmroth, M., Laitinen, T. V., Janhunen, P., Milan, S. E., Grocott, A., Cowley, S. W. H., Pulkkinen, T., & Gérard, J.-C. (2006b). Compression of the Earth’s magnetotail by interplanetary shocks directly drives transient magnetic flux closure. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *33*, L10105. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL026008>

- Hubert, B., Blockx, C., Milan, S. E., & Cowley, S. W. H. (2009). Statistical properties of flux closure induced by solar wind dynamic pressure fronts. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *114*, A07211. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JA013813>
- Kauristie, K., Weygand, J., Pulkkinen, T. I., Murphree, J. S., & Newell, P. T. (1999). Size of the auroral oval: UV ovals and precipitation boundaries compared. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *104*(A2), 2321–2331.
- Kelley, M. C. (1989). *The Earth's Ionosphere*, Academic Press, New York.
- Kennel, C. F., & Petschek, H. E. (1966). Limit on stably trapped particle fluxes. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *71*, 1.
- Kihn, E. A., Redmon, R., Ridley, A. J., & Hairston, M. R. (2006). A statistical comparison of the AMIE derived and DMSP-SSIES observed high-latitude ionospheric electric field. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *111*, A08303. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JA011310>
- Kikuchi, T., & Araki, T. (1979). Horizontal transmission of the polar electric field to the equator. *J. Atmos. Terr. Phys.*, *41*, 927–936.
- Kikuchi, T., & Araki, T. (2002). Comment on “Propagation of the preliminary reverse impulse of sudden commencements to low latitudes” by P. J. Chi et al. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *107*(A12), 1473. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JA009220>
- Knight, S. (1973). Parallel electric fields. *Planet. Space Sci.*, *21*, 741.
- Liou, K. (2006). Global auroral response to interplanetary media with emphasis on solar wind dynamic pressure enhancements. In *Recurrent Magnetic Storms: Corotating Solar Wind Streams*, *Geophys. Monogr. Ser.*, vol. 167, edited by B. Tsurutani et al., pp. 197–212, AGU, Washington, D. C.
- Lu, G., et al. (1996). High-latitude ionospheric electrodynamics as determined by the assimilative mapping of ionospheric electrodynamics procedure for the conjunctive SUNDIAL/ATLAS 1/GEM period of March 28–29, 1992, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *101*(A12), 26,697–26,718. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96JA00513>
- Lu, G., et al. (1998). Global energy deposition during the January 1997 magnetic cloud event. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *103*(A6), 11,685–11,694. <https://doi.org/10.1029/98JA00897>
- Lummerzheim, D., Brittnacher, M., Evans, D., Germany, G. A., Parks, G. K., Rees, M. H., & Spann, J. F. (1997). High time resolution study of the hemispheric power carried by energetic electrons into the ionosphere during the May 19/20, 1996 auroral activity. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *24*, 987–990.
- Lyons, L. R. (2000). Geomagnetic disturbances: characteristics of, distinction between types, and relations to interplanetary conditions. *J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys.*, *62*, 1087–1114.
- Lyons, L. R., Evans, D., & Lundin, R. (1979). An observed relation between magnetic field aligned electric fields and downward electron energy fluxes in the vicinity of auroral forms. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *84*, 457.
- Lyons, L. R., Lee, D.-Y., Wang, C.-P., & Mende, S. B. (2005). Global auroral responses to abrupt solar wind changes: Dynamic pressure, substorm, and null events. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *110*, A08208, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JA011089>
- Lyons, L. R., Nishimura, Y., Donovan, E., & Angelopoulos, V. (2013). Distinction between auroral substorm onset and traditional ground magnetic onset signatures. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *118*, 4080–4092, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgra.50384>
- Milan, S. E., Cowley, S. W. H., Lester, M., Wright, D. M., Slavin, J. A., Fillingim, M., Carlson, C. W., & Singer, H. J. (2004). Response of the magnetotail to changes in the open flux

- content of the magnetosphere. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *109*, A04220. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JA010350>
- Mishin, V. M., Mishin, V. V., Lunyushkin, S. B., Wang, J. Y., & Moiseev, A. V. (2017). 27 August 2001 substorm: Preonset phenomena, two main onsets, field-aligned current systems, and plasma flow channels in the ionosphere and in the magnetosphere. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *122*, 4988–5007, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JA023915>
- Miyashita, Y., Keika, K., Liou, K., Machida, S., Kamide, Y., Miyoshi, Y., Matsumoto, Y., Shinohara, I., Saito, Y., & Mukai, T. (2010). Plasma sheet changes caused by sudden enhancements of the solar wind pressure, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *115*, A05214. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JA014617>
- Newell, P. T., Feldstein, Y. I., Galperin, Y. I., & Meng, C.-I. (1996). Morphology of nightside precipitation. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *101*(A5), 10,737–10,748.
- Oliveira, D. M., & Raeder, J. (2014). Impact angle control of interplanetary shock geoeffectiveness. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *119*, 8188. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JA020275>
- Oliveira, D. M., & Raeder, J. (2015). Impact angle control of interplanetary shock geoeffectiveness: A statistical study. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *120*, 4313–4323. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JA021147>
- Ozturk, D. S., Zou, S., Ridley, A. J., & Slavin, J. A. (2018). Modeling study of the geospace system response to the solar wind dynamic pressure enhancement on 17 March 2015. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *123*, 2974–2989. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JA025099>
- Paschmann, G., Øieroset, M., & Phan, T. (2013). In-situ observations of reconnection in space. *Space Sci. Rev.*, *178*, 385–417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-012-9957-2>
- Pulkkinen, A., et al. (2013). Community-wide validation of geospace model ground magnetic field perturbation predictions to support model transition to operations. *Space Weather*, *11*, 369–385. <https://doi.org/10.1002/swe.20056>
- Raeder, J. (2003). Global Magnetohydrodynamics – A Tutorial. In *Space Plasma Simulation, Lecture Notes in Physics*, vol. 615, edited by J. Buechner, C. T. Dum, and M. Scholer, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg.
- Raeder, J. (2006). Flux Transfer Events: 1. generation mechanism for strong southward IMF. *Ann. Geophys.*, *24*, 381–392.
- Raeder, J., Berchem, J., & Ashour-Abdalla, M. (1996). The importance of small scale processes in global MHD simulations: Some numerical experiments. In *The Physics of Space Plasmas*, 14, 403, edited by T. Chang and J. R. Jasperse, MIT Cent. for Theoret. Geo/Cosmo Plasma Phys., Cambridge, Mass.
- Raeder, J., Larson, D., Li, W., Kepko, E. L., & Fuller-Rowell, T. (2008). OpenGGCM simulations for the THEMIS mission. *Space Sci. Rev.*, *141*, 535–555. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-008-9421-5>
- Raeder, J., McPherron, R. L., Frank, L. A., Kokubun, S., Lu, G., Mukai, T., Paterson, W. R., Sigwarth, J. B., Singer, H. J., & Slavin, J. A. (2001a). Global simulation of the Geospace Environment Modeling substorm challenge event. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *106*(A1), 381–395.
- Raeder, J., Wang, Y. L., & Fuller-Rowell, T. J. (2001b). Geomagnetic storm simulation with a coupled magnetosphere-ionosphere-thermosphere model. In *Space Weather: Progress and Challenges in Research and Applications, Geophys. Monogr. Ser.*, vol. 125, edited by P. Song, H. J. Singer, and G. Siscoe, pp. 377–384, AGU, Washington, D. C.


- Rich, F. J., & Hairston, M. R. (1994). Large-scale convection patterns observed by DMSP. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 99(A3), 3827–3844. <https://doi.org/10.1029/93JA03296>
- Richmond, A. D., & Kamide, Y. (1988). Mapping electrodynamic features of the high-latitude ionosphere from localized observations: Technique. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 93, 5741–5759.
- Ridley, A. J., Lu, G., Clauer, C. R., & Papitashvili, V. O. (1998). A statistical study of the ionospheric convection response to changing interplanetary magnetic field conditions using the assimilative mapping of ionospheric electrodynamics technique. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 4023–4039.
- Robinson, R. M., Vondrak, R. R., Miller, K., Dabbs, T., & Hardy, D. (1987). On calculating ionospheric conductances from the flux and energy of precipitating electrons. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 92, 2565.
- Shi, Q.-Q., et al. (2013). THEMIS observations of ULF wave excitation in the nightside plasma sheet during sudden impulse events. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, 118, 284–298. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JA017984>
- Siscoe, G. L., & Huang, T. S. (1985). Polar cap inflation and deflation. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 90, 543.
- Terasawa, T., et al. (1997). Solar wind control of density and temperature in the near-Earth plasma sheet: WIND/GEOTAIL collaboration. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 24, 935–938. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96GL04018>
- Vasyliunas, V. M. (1970). Mathematical models of magnetospheric convection and its coupling to the ionosphere. In *Particles and Fields in the Magnetosphere*, edited by B. M. McCormac and D. Reidel, pp. 61–71, Norwell, Mass.
- Wang, C.-P., Lyons, L. R., Nagai, T., Weygand, J. M., & Lui, A. T. Y. (2010). Evolution of plasma sheet particle content under different interplanetary magnetic field conditions. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, A06210. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JA015028>
- Wang, C.-P., Yue, C., Zaharia, S., Xing, X., Lyons, L., Angelopoulos, V., Nagai, T., & Lui, T. (2013). Empirical modeling of plasma sheet pressure and three-dimensional force-balanced magnetospheric magnetic field structure: 1. Observation, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, 118, 6154–6165. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgra.50585>
- Weimer, D. R., Ober, D. M., Maynard, N. C., Collier, M. R., McComas, D. J., Ness, N. F., Smith, C. W., & Watermann, J. (2003). Predicting interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) propagation delay times using the minimum variance technique. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(A1), 1026. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JA009405>
- Weimer, D. R. (2004). Correction to “Predicting interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) propagation delay times using the minimum variance technique.” *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, A12104. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JA010691>
- Weygand, J. M., & McPherron, R. L. (2006a). Wind 3DP Weimer Propagated 60 s Resolution in GSM Coordinates, <https://doi.org/10.21978/P82K7X>
- Weygand, J. M., & McPherron, R. L. (2006b). Wind Weimer Propagated 60 s Resolution Tri-axial Fluxgate Magnetometer in GSM Coordinates. <https://doi.org/10.21978/P8FW5P>
- Yue, C., Nishimura, Y., Lyons, L. R., Angelopoulos, V., Donovan, E. F., Shi, Q., Yao, Z., & Bonnell, J. W. (2013). Coordinated THEMIS spacecraft and all-sky imager observations of interplanetary shock effects on plasma sheet flow bursts, poleward boundary intensifications, and streamers. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, 118, 3346–3356. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgra.50372>
- Zesta, E., Singer, H. J., Lummerzheim, D., Russell, C. T., Lyons, L. R., & Brittnacher, M. J. (2000). The effect of the January 10, 1997, pressure pulse on the magnetosphere-

ionosphere current system. In *Magnetospheric Current Systems, Geophys. Monogr. Ser.*, vol. 118, edited by S. Ohtani, R. Fujii, M. Hesse, and R. L. Lysak, pp. 217–226, AGU, Washington, D. C.


Zhou, X.-Y., & Tsurutani, B. T. (2002). Interplanetary shock effects on the nightside auroral zone, magnetosphere and ionosphere. In *Proceedings of COSPAR Colloquium on Space Weather Study Using Multi-Point Techniques*, edited by Ling-Hsiao Lyu, pp. 139–147, COSPAR Colloquia Series, 12, Elsevier Sci. Ltd.









Zhou X., Zhou, X.-Z., Angelopoulos, V., Shi, Q., Wang, C.-P., & Frey, H. (2013). Interplanetary shock-induced current sheet disturbances leading to auroral activations: THEMIS observations, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, 118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgra.50175>







UVI polar cap boundary, 11 February 2000 (day 042)







OpenGGCM polar cap boundary, 11 February 2000 (day 042)












12 MLT 11 February 2000 (DOY 042)
Northern Hemisphere
2357 UT



Dayside: Max Rate = 55.2 mV/m Total Rate = 71.7 kV
Nightside: Max Rate = 26.6 mV/m Total Rate = 90.5 kV



12 MLT 11 February 2000 (DOY 042)
Northern Hemisphere
2357 UT



Dayside: Max Rate = 59.0 mV/m Total Rate = 74.5 kV
Nightside: Max Rate = 37.1 mV/m Total Rate = 64.0 kV

