Internal structure of magnetic clouds: Plasma and composition
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A comprehensive analysis of magnetic clouds observed by the Advanced Composition Explorer (ACE) spacecraft from February 1998 to July 2001 is presented. The magnetic field data from the MAG instrument is fit with the cylindrically symmetric, linear force-free model and the fit parameter distributions are examined. This magnetic field model enables us to map plasma data from the SWEPAM and SWICS instruments to a position within the model cylinder. A superposed epoch analysis of all our magnetic cloud events is used to construct diameter cuts through an “average” cloud profile in any desired plasma, elemental composition, or charge state quantity. These diameter cuts are found to have nontrivial structure and there appears to be significant composition and structural differences between clouds of different speeds. The slow magnetic clouds \((V_{rad}) < 500 \text{ km/s}\) have an almost constant proton density profile whereas the fast magnetic cloud \((V_{rad}) \geq 500 \text{ km/s}\) profile is depleted throughout with symmetric dips and a local maximum at the cloud center. The fast magnetic clouds have a slightly higher \(N_O/N_H\) ratio than the slow clouds. Both the fast and slow events have enhanced oxygen and iron charge states compared to the slow solar wind. The fast events have a slightly increased \(O^7+/O^6+\) average profile and a much stronger \(Fe^{16+}/Fe^{\text{total}}\) profile than the slow events. We briefly discuss the implications for physical conditions at the Sun, the role these coronal mass ejections (CMEs) may play in transporting magnetic flux, and the application of our structure results to the current flux rope CME modeling effort.
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1. Introduction

Magnetic clouds are the most well-ordered manifestation of coronal mass ejections observed in the interplanetary medium (ICMEs). Magnetic clouds are magnetically dominated ejecta with a relatively simple magnetic field geometry. This geometry defines a distinct signature which gives rise to the three criteria necessary for identification: (1) the magnetic field direction undergoes a smooth, monotonic rotation over a large angle, (2) the magnetic field strength is higher than average, and (3) the proton temperature is lower than average [Burlaga, 1991]. Anywhere from one-third [Gosling, 1990] to one-half [Cane et al., 1997] of ICMEs exhibit some or all of these magnetic cloud characteristics. The duration of a typical magnetic cloud event at 1 AU can vary from several hours to days.

The magnetic field structure of these clouds has been well studied and thus provides a convincing link between magnetic clouds and eruptive prominences at the Sun. The cloud’s magnetic orientation is strongly correlated to those of filaments on the solar surface in both field direction and helicity [Rust, 1994, 1999; Bothmer and Schwenn, 1994, 1998]. Since filament polarity and helicity change with the solar cycle one would expect to see a similar change in magnetic cloud orientations assuming their origin was related to filaments. Mulligan et al. [1998] have shown this clear solar cycle variation in magnetic cloud orientation strengthening the link between the two phenomena.

In addition to the magnetic signatures of ICMEs, elemental composition and charge state measurements have become an important tool in describing the solar environment of the ICME origin [e.g., Geiss et al., 1995]. Solar wind charge state measurements have become routinely available with the composition measurements from the Solar Wind Ion Composition Spectrometer (SWICS) that has been part of the ACE and Ulysses investigations [Gloeckler et al., 1998, 1992]. ICMEs are often associated with unusual charge state compositions, indicating a thermal environment during the CME initiation that is very different
from the physical conditions characterizing the average solar wind [Galvin, 1997 and references therein]. This might be expected based on remote sensing measurements of coronal ejecta.

With recent LASCO observations, CME events are routinely associated with disappearing filaments/erupting prominence material [Dere et al., 1999; Plunkett et al., 2000]. This could result in a prediction for low charge state ions within ICMEs. Such time periods have been observed based on the measurements of He$^+$ that is not usually present in the solar wind [Schwenn et al., 1980; Zwickl et al., 1983]. More recently, Burlaga et al. [1998] have seen a small region of very cold, dense material with unusual ion charge states consistent with expected prominence temperatures in a CME in January 1997. Skoug et al. [1999] saw a prolonged enhancement of He$^+$ over the latter half of a magnetic cloud in ACE data in May 1998, and Gloeckler et al. [1999] observed a wide variety of both unusually low and unusually high ion charge states during the same event.

Such observations are indicative of plasma related to prominence material. However, these “cool” events are very rare. During the entire time period during which reliable composition data are available by WIND and ACE, fewer than 10 events were observed with unusually low charge state ratios. Instead, most CMEs are associated with unusually high charge states, indicating a heated electron environment during the initiation and eruption. While a heated electron environment is most likely the cause, high ion charge states may also be caused by superthermal electrons [e.g., Owocki and Scudder, 1983; Esser and Edgar, 2000] or hot, high density ions [e.g., Bürgi and Geiss, 1986].

The heavy ion charge state ratios are ratios of the measured ion densities. High oxygen charge states were studied by Henke et al. [1998, 2001] and Reinard et al. [2001], showing many CMEs are associated with O$^{5+}$/O$^{4+}$ > 1.0. Lepri et al. [2001] has confirmed previous indications that high iron charge states Fe$^{16+}$ are a good identifier of CME material [e.g., Bame et al., 1979; Fenimore, 1980; Galvin, 1997].

This paper presents a supplement to the traditional analysis of magnetic clouds by emphasizing the internal structure of the plasma and charge states derived from the inherent geometry of the linear force-free magnetic field model. Section 2 describes the ACE data and our event selection procedure. The linear force-free model and parameter fitting are reviewed in section 3, and our fitting results are presented in a larger solar wind/solar cycle context in section 4. In section 5 we describe our method of inferring spatial position and the results of the superposed epoch analysis: significant internal structure and its differences between fast and slow events. Section 6 includes a brief discussion of the implications of the composition differences between clouds of different velocities but otherwise identical magnetic signatures as well as some possible constraints this structure has on various magnetic cloud or flux rope CME creation models.

2. Data Description and Event Selection

We have identified and modeled 56 magnetic cloud events observed by the ACE spacecraft between February 1998 and July 2001. The magnetic field data were from the Magnetic Field Experiment (MAG) instrument [Smith et al., 1998], the plasma data were from the Solar Wind Electron Proton Alpha Monitor (SWEPAM) instrument [McComas et al., 1998], and the ion charge states were from the Solar Wind Ion Composition Spectrometer (SWICS) instrument [Gloeckler et al., 1998]. One hour data averages were used for all quantities throughout this study with the exception of the high ion charge states, which were 2 hour averages to enhance statistics.

Figure 1 shows a magnetic cloud event from 25 September 1998 (DOY 268). The first three panels are the magnetic field magnitude, latitude $\delta$, and longitude $\lambda$ in RTN coordinates. The enhanced field magnitude and smooth rotation are evident in this particularly good example. The fourth panel is the radial velocity which shows a steady decrease throughout the event, consistent with cloud expansion. The fifth and sixth panels are proton density $N_p$ and temperature $T_p$. The proton temperature has well defined boundaries and is clearly “low” during the event compared to the surrounding solar wind. Here, Figure 1 is again an excellent example, and the proton temperature signature is usually less ordered. The remaining panels are the composition measurements we will focus on: the density ratio of alpha particles to protons $N_{\alpha}/N_{p}$, and the high oxygen and iron charge state ratios, O$^{7+}$/O$^{6+}$ and Fe$^{16+}$/Fe$^{total}$. All three of these quantities indicate ICME material. The Borrini et al. [1982] enhanced helium ICME identification criteria, $N_{\alpha}/N_{p}$ > 0.08–0.10, is met during most of the cloud. The O$^{7+}$/O$^{6+}$ ratio > 1.0 is higher than the upper limit of the slow solar wind distribution [Zurbuchen et al., 2002; von Steiger et al., 2000], and Lepri et al. [2001] showed convincingly that Fe$^{16+}$/Fe$^{total}$ > 0.1 virtually always overlaps with other ICME indicators. Some of these enhancements even extend beyond the magnetic field defined boundaries. This event was also relatively fast, $(V_{rad}) \sim 600$ km/s. We will show these types of composition enhancements are more common in clouds of this velocity class.

Our magnetic cloud events are initially selected through visual inspection of 27-day plots of the magnetic field and proton temperature time series, using the Burlaga [1991] criteria as a starting point. The smooth field rotation was required for all events. The linear, force-free cylinder described in section 3 can model up to a 180$^\circ$ total field rotation but has difficulty with small field rotations less than ~30–50$^\circ$ between the two spherical coordinate angles. Some authors include the “no rotation” limit as a qualifying smooth rotation (D. Berdichevsky, private communication, 2002), but in this study we have not.

The enhanced field and low proton temperature were qualitatively compared with the ambient solar wind values on this 27-day timescale. The reference field enhancement tended to be >50% with some exceptions. For events with well defined low proton temperature boundaries (such as in Figure 1), the field enhancement requirement was sometimes relaxed to allow approximate equality with the surrounding solar wind. These cases have been described as “old” magnetic clouds (C. Smith, private communication, 2002) whose internal field strength has evolved to match the surrounding solar wind value but retain the magnetic shape and plasma characteristics of a magnetic cloud. These
quantitative boundary identification procedure (L. Burlaga, 1995), boundaries were selected. There is still not a robust, definitive method for details). Here the magnetic cloud boundary is indicated by the vertical solid lines (see Figure 1). ACE data from the 25 September 1998 magnetic cloud event plotted against day of year. The temperature used by Richardson and Cane [1995] for ICME identification.

events have been included because of our interest in the internal plasma structure which related more to the magnetic geometry. The level of magnetic field enhancement can be inferred from the model fit parameter $B_0$ discussed in section 3.2. The proton temperature values tended to be significantly lower than the immediately surrounding solar wind, often with well-defined boundaries. There were a number of events where the proton temperature boundaries were not well defined but the values were still low compared with the solar wind on a Carrington rotation timescale. This was a crude, qualitative approximation to the more velocity dependent quantitative measure of low proton temperature used by Richardson and Cane [1995] for ICME identification.

Once a candidate event was identified, the exact boundaries were selected. There is still not a robust, quantitative boundary identification procedure (L. Burlaga, private communication, 2002), thus our boundary selection was a qualitative and somewhat iterative process. After our first guess based on the maximum extent of the field rotation, we checked for sharp changes in $B$, $T_p$, or $V_{rad}$ within a couple of hours of the initial boundaries. If so, we used that change as the new boundary. This tended to yield a fairly conservative estimate of the cloud region and it was not uncommon for one or more of the classic characteristics to extend beyond our selected region.

The fuzziness of the boundary selection is by no means detrimental to our final results. Since most events are $\sim 10–30$ hours in duration, $\pm 1$ hour is at most 10% of the cloud. The limitations of the model and the systematic uncertainties in fitting (discussed in section 3.3) have at least the same order error.

For completeness, we would like to note that Shimazu and Marubashi [2000] have used the third derivative of the field components as a quantitative measure of smooth rotation to identify flux ropes. Using this measure, the boundary selection comes naturally as the first/last points to fit the selection criteria. However, this method also selects regions which cannot be fit with the linear force-free cylinder, so in this study we have employed the more traditional identification techniques described above.

3. Model Description and Fitting Technique

3.1. Linear Force-Free Cylinder

Goldstein [1983] proposed that large interplanetary magnetic field rotations could be described as a cylindrical force-free flux rope. Burlaga [1988] introduced what has become the standard model for the internal magnetic field configuration within these clouds: cylindrically symmetric, force-free, with constant $\alpha$, where $\alpha$ is the magnitude of the magnetic helicity. In general, $\alpha$ is a function of radial distance and an entire class of solutions could be considered from an appropriate generating function [Lust and Schluter, 1954]. The force-free configuration is a minimum energy state for a given helicity. Intuitively, one suspects that regardless of the original configuration, the magnetic fields in these clouds are likely to relax toward a force-free state. In order for this force-free state to be linear, i.e., constant $\alpha$, a tremendous amount of internal reconnection must have taken place. While this may be the case in magnetic cloud ICMEs, it is by no means certain.

The constant $\alpha$ configuration is the Lundquist [1950] solution of the equation for force-free magnetic fields,

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \alpha \mathbf{B}. \tag{1}$$

In cylindrical coordinates, this yields field components,

$$B_\rho = 0, \quad B_\phi = H B_\rho J_1(\alpha \rho), \quad B_z = B_\rho J_0(\alpha \rho). \tag{2}$$

Here $B_0$ is the field magnitude on the cylinder axis, $\rho$ is the distance from the axis, $H$ is the sign of the helicity, and $J_0$, $J_1$ are zeroth and first order Bessel functions. The constant value of $\alpha$ is determined by the radius of the cloud model cylinder $R_c$, such that their product is the first zero of $J_0$.

The cylinder orientation in space is described by three parameters. The axis orientation with respect to the ecliptic is given by two angles, $\phi_0$, $\theta_0$, while the distance

\begin{align*}
&\text{Cloud} \\
&\text{Figure 1. ACE data from the 25 September 1998 magnetic cloud event plotted against day of year. The cloud boundary is indicated by the vertical solid lines (see text for details). Here } \delta \text{ and } \lambda \text{ are the magnetic field latitude and longitude in RTN coordinates. There is a } N_p/N_0 \text{ data gap before the cloud. All data are 1-hour averages except the high iron charge state ratio, which are 2-hour averages.}
\end{align*}
The spacecraft trajectory goes right through the symmetry between the spacecraft and the cylinder axis at the normals given by equation (2) are shown as solid and dashed lines. The two angles, $\phi_0$, $\theta_0$, define the cylinder axis orientation with respect to the ecliptic and $\rho(t)$ is the distance to the spacecraft perpendicular to the cloud axis. The impact parameter $p_0$ is the distance of closest approach.

between the spacecraft and the cylinder axis at the normalized closest point of approach is $p_0$. A cloud event for which the spacecraft trajectory goes right through the symmetry axis would have $p_0 = 0$, while the outer cloud boundary is defined as $p_0 = 1$. The direction of $p_0$ is taken to be the y-axis in the cloud frame. Figure 2 shows these parameters in a schematic for the cloud axis moving past the spacecraft in ACE-centered coordinates (RTN).

### 3.2. Fitting Procedure

[19] We have adopted the two-step least-squares fitting routine for parameter optimization described by Lepping et al. [1990] and will briefly review it here. The first step of the fitting procedure is to fit the cylinder direction and impact parameter. This is done by minimizing $\chi^2_{dir}$, defined as the sum of the mean square error between the unit normalized data and model ($B^M$) field components. The second fit is solely for the axial field strength $B_0$. The direction of $B_0$ is taken to be the y-axis in the cloud frame. $\chi^2_{mag}$ is defined as the mean square error between the data and model field magnitudes.

$$\chi^2_{dir} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( (B_x - B^M_x)^2 + (B_y - B^M_y)^2 + (B_z - B^M_z)^2 \right)$$

$$\chi^2_{mag} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (|B| - |B^M|)^2$$

Here, $N$ is the number of data points during the event.

[20] Table 1 lists each set of model fit parameters and their corresponding direction and magnitude errors. The linear force-free cylinder does a much better job modeling the field rotations than the field magnitude. This is represented in the $\chi^2_{dir}$ and $\chi^2_{mag}$ errors. The $\chi^2_{dir}$ error is used to evaluate the quality of the model fit. A good fit typically has $\chi^2_{dir} < 0.13$, a moderate fit is approximately $0.13 - 0.20$, and $\chi^2_{dir} > 0.20$ is generally a poor angle fit.

[21] The $\chi^2_{mag}$ errors cannot be classified in a similar manner because of the varying “background” field strength. To illustrate this, Figure 3 shows a couple different model fits. The dotted lines are the data and the thick solid lines are the model. The left event is a moderate angle fit with a typical magnitude error, and the right event is a good angle fit with a relatively large magnitude error.

### 3.3. Best-Fit Parameter Distributions

[22] Figure 4 shows our model parameter distributions for the spatial orientation parameters, $\phi_0$, $\theta_0$, $p_0$, the axial magnetic field strength $B_0$, the cloud radius $R_c$, and the event averaged radial velocity $\langle V_{rad} \rangle$. In each plot the outlined bars are the slow cloud distribution and the thick-lined gray bars are the fast cloud distribution. This is evident from the $\langle V_{rad} \rangle$ histogram where we have classified slow cloud events as having $\langle V_{rad} \rangle < 500$ km/s and fast clouds $\geq 500$ km/s.

[23] The two speed categories were created after it had become apparent that the faster events had stronger enhancements in the heavy ion charge states. The dividing line of 500 km/s was chosen because of a slight indication of a local minimum in the average velocity distribution, although this is not visible on the scale of the $\langle V_{rad} \rangle$ histogram of Figure 4. There were 44 slow cloud events and 12 fast cloud events. More events are needed in the $\sim 500$ km/s range to determine if the composition results of section 5 are truly bimodal or just the two ends of a continuous transition.

[24] Table 2 summarizes the averages and standard deviations for the distributions of Figure 4. In general, our parameter distributions agree with the results of other surveys. Lepping et al. [1990] found parameter averages very similar to ours: $\langle \phi_0 \rangle = 106 \pm 38^\circ$, $\langle \theta_0 \rangle = -15 \pm 47^\circ$, $\langle p_0 \rangle = 0.22 \pm 0.22$, and $\langle B_0 \rangle = 19.6 \pm 6.5$ nT. Bothmer and Schwenn [1998] assumed $p_0 = 0$ as found average axis orientation angles of $\langle \phi_0 \rangle = 91 \pm 44^\circ$, and $\langle \theta_0 \rangle = 3 \pm 35^\circ$.

[25] The $\phi_0$ distributions for fast and slow clouds are similar, while the $\theta_0$ distributions have averages that differ by approximately 15°. The fewer number of fast cloud events and the large rms prohibits drawing any solid conclusions about the polar angle distribution. The impact parameter distributions are similar for the two velocity classes. The fitting procedure appears to have a bias toward a zero or almost zero impact parameter, as evident in both fast and slow distributions. Russell and Mulligan [2002] have argued that the impact parameter distribution can be easily explained with an ellipsoidal flux rope geometry. The cylindrical model used here would systematically underestimate the impact parameter if this were the case.

[26] The fast clouds appear to have stronger on-axis magnetic fields but show more statistical variation. One supposes if the cloud’s radial velocity was related to the creation mechanism, fast clouds would have more energy and thus stronger magnetic fields. One must be a little cautious however, as the 1 AU velocity is a combination of the original CME velocity and the interaction of the ejecta with the background solar wind during transit. The fast cloud radii are only slightly larger on average than their slower counterparts, although the shape of the $R_c$ distributions is again almost the same. In general, the fast and slow...
clouds appear to be fairly similar in their model fit parameters and the statistical uncertainties in the $B_0$ and $R_c$ distributions prohibit any significant conclusions being drawn about their relation to cloud speed.

### 3.4. Limitations and Fit Parameter Uncertainties

The linear force-free cylinder model is a simple but very useful analysis tool. It is important to understand the limitations of this model. We have briefly mentioned the discrepancy between the field direction and magnitude fit errors, due mostly to the model’s inherent symmetry and the $\sim2:1$ center-to-edge field strength. We have found that the model fit parameters are not independent near the error minimums of equations (3) and (4). We will also present a rough estimate for the systematic uncertainty in the best fit parameter $\rho_0$ and compare it to the more sophisticated estimate by Lepping et al. [2002].
The routine used to implement the least squares fitting also calculates the covariance between parameters during optimization. The first fit adjusts $f_0$, $q_0$, and $r_0$. Since $H$ only has two values, ±1, it is too constrained for our minimization routine to vary. The average correlation coefficients between the spatial variables were $\rho_{fq} = 0.06 \pm 0.56$, $\rho_{fr} = -0.24 \pm 0.82$, and $\rho_{qr} = 0.01 \pm 0.73$. The high rms error indicates that despite low average correlations over our entire set of events, in each individual fit the parameters were often highly correlated. The average absolute values of these coefficients were $|\rho_{fq}| = 0.45 \pm 0.34$, $|\rho_{fr}| = 0.79 \pm 0.31$, and $|\rho_{qr}| = 0.63 \pm 0.35$.

Since the axial magnetic field magnitude $B_0$ is fit singularly holding the rest of the parameters fixed, its correlation coefficients are generated separately after the initial fitting. There was no correlation between $B_0$ and $\phi_0$ or $b_0$. We would expect some correlation between $B_0$ and the impact parameter $\rho_0$ because of the functional dependence. We found there was less variation in this lower correlation, $\rho_{B0} = 0.15 \pm 0.15$.

All of the spatial structure of section 5 is inferred from the geometry of the static, linear force-free magnetic field model. The systematic model uncertainty inherent in the best fit parameter $\rho_0$ propagates through our mapping procedure. In order to examine this effect on the results of section 5 we need to quantify this systematic uncertainty.

If we treat the observed magnetic field component $B_i$ as a Gaussian random variable distributed about the model value $B_i^M$ with a unit variance, then the expected value of $\chi^2 = (\chi^2_{dir} + \chi^2_{mag})/3$ will be 1. We define the parameter uncertainty $\sigma_p$ such that the change from $\rho_0$ to $\rho_0 + \sigma_p$ causes the mean model value $B_i^M$ to go to $B_i^M + \sigma_B$, where $\sigma_B$ is defined as the width of the observation random variable, unity. The expected value of $\chi^2_{dir}$ becomes 2 and $\chi^2_{mag}$ = 1 corresponds to a 1 $\sigma_B$ change in the mean model value for every data point. The average $\sigma_B$ to cause this change was $\langle \sigma_B \rangle = 0.22 \pm 0.10$. The assumption that our observations are distributed as a Gaussian about the model value is one of convenience, although on the scale of the normalized fields the error width is quite large.

Recently, Lepping et al. [2002] have investigated this issue of the uncertainties in the best fit parameters by running Monte Carlo simulations of trend noise derived

Figure 3. Two magnetic cloud model fits plotted versus time (day of year). The dotted lines are the ACE MAG data, the field magnitude, latitude ($\delta$), and longitude ($\lambda$) in RTN coordinates. The solid lines are the model fits described in section 3. (left) The 12 July 2000 (DOY 193) event shows a moderate angle fit $\chi^2_{dir} = 0.156$ and a typical magnitude error $\chi^2_{mag} = 2.29$. (right) The 9 November 1998 (DOY 313) event shows a good angle fit $\chi^2_{dir} = 0.100$ and one of the higher magnitude errors, $\chi^2_{mag} = 13.68$. 
from data. For “medium” to “high” noise conditions they obtained uncertainties for $f_0$ and $q_0$ on the order of $10^{-20}$ degrees and a value of $\sigma_0 \approx 0.2–0.3$. While our approach is quite different, we obtain almost identical results for the estimate of $\langle \sigma_i \rangle$.

4. Magnetic Clouds During the Solar Cycle

4.1. Axial Current and Toroidal Flux

[33] From the model geometry and the cylinder fit parameters we can derive the total axial current and the toroidal (or axial) magnetic flux of these clouds. Both quantities are related to the cloud radius and axial field strength model parameters, $I_z \propto B_0R_c$ and $\Phi_z \propto B_0R_c^2$. The marginal differences between slow and fast magnetic clouds seen in the average field strength and cloud size model parameters are slightly more apparent in the current and flux distributions but perhaps still not statistically significant. These calculations rely heavily on the model geometry and are therefore the roughest of estimates and probably a lower bound. The multipoint observations of Mulligan and Russell [2001] imply an elliptic cross-section with a 4:1 ratio suggesting a factor of 4 would be required to correct the flux derived from the cylindrical model.

[34] The top panel of Figure 5 shows the axial current distribution plotted against the logarithm of current in Amps. The outlined bars are slow clouds; the gray bars are fast clouds in the style of Figure 4. The lower panel is the distribution of logarithmic toroidal magnetic flux passing through the circular cloud cross section.

[35] The role magnetic clouds play in the reconfiguration of the solar global field is surely related to flux transport from the Sun into the heliosphere. Figure 6 shows the cumulative total toroidal magnetic flux as a function of time added to the heliosphere from our observed magnetic cloud events at 1 AU. The toroidal flux transported by the

Table 2. Average Model Parameter/Physical Quantity Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter/Quantity</th>
<th>Slow Clouds</th>
<th>Fast Clouds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of events</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>\phi_0</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_0$</td>
<td>−6 ± 40 deg</td>
<td>8 ± 34 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_0$</td>
<td>0.14 ± 0.21</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_0$</td>
<td>12.3 ± 4.7 nT</td>
<td>19.3 ± 9.7 nT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_c$</td>
<td>0.086 ± 0.041 AU</td>
<td>0.121 ± 0.049 AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{rad}$</td>
<td>392 ± 46 km/s</td>
<td>616 ± 97 km/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta t$</td>
<td>22.7 ± 8.0 hours</td>
<td>21.3 ± 6.7 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_z$</td>
<td>4.30 ± 2.62 × 10^{10} A</td>
<td>10.0 ± 6.45 × 10^{10} A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi_z$</td>
<td>3.67 ± 3.76 × 10^{20} Mx</td>
<td>11.7 ± 11.1 × 10^{20} Mx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fast magnetic clouds (21% of events) is equal to 46.5% of the total.

These magnetic clouds are responsible for adding an 
\( \sim 8.6 \times 10^{21} \) Mx/yr during our selected time period. If we assume this rate is constant then magnetic clouds would produce \( \sim 10^{23} \) Mx of toroidal magnetic flux over the 11-year solar cycle. If magnetic clouds are 33% of all CMEs, then the total toroidal flux transported by CMEs is three times that. Unipolar clouds have their axis highly inclined with respect to the ecliptic and thus have a single signed Bz value. There are four unipolar categories corresponding to east-west (ENW, ESW) and west-east (WNE, WSE) cloud orientations, describing the leading, trailing sign of Bz. From the fit parameters in Table 1 we see that the unipolar clouds typically have \( |\theta_0| > 30^\circ \) and small \( r_0 \).

Eight orientation categories classify a vast majority of the cloud events, however a small number of our clouds were not easily identifiable as belonging to any one of these categories, i.e., their rotations projected onto the Y-Z plane did not fulfill all the requirements given by Mulligan et al. [1998]. These cases are indicated in Table 1 with a question mark (?). To classify these orientations, we “rounded” using a combination of the data and the model fits.

The handedness or chirality of the magnetic field rotations in the Y-Z plane can be determined from the model fit parameters \( \phi_0 \) and \( H \) with the formula

\[
C = \text{sgn}(\sin \phi_0) \cdot H, 
\]

such that \( C \) is +1 for clouds with right handed Y-Z rotations and -1 for left handed Y-Z rotations. The right handed Y-Z

\[ \text{Figure 5.} \] (top) The histogram distribution of the total logarithmic axial current in Amps, in the same style as Figure 4. (bottom) The distribution of total logarithmic axial (toroidal) magnetic flux in Maxwells.

\[ \text{Figure 6.} \] The total cumulative toroidal magnetic flux carried by magnetic cloud ICMEs observed at 1 AU. The fast cloud contribution is \( \sim 46\% \) of the total flux while being only 21% of the events.
rotations are SWN, NES, ESW, and WNE. The $\phi_0$ values of 0.0 and 180.0 in Table 1 are rounded to a single decimal place, so equation (5) always gave ±1.

Figure 7 compares our magnetic orientation evolution during the maximum of solar cycle 23 seen by ACE and the evolution during the same time period in solar cycle 21 seen by PVO as presented by Mulligan et al. [1998]. The histograms are normalized for ease of comparison between the two data sets, and we note that 2001 only represents 7 months of data rather than a full year. Solar maximum of cycle 21 was 1979–1981 while solar maximum for cycle 23 was approximately 1999–2001 with a slight indication of a double peak. The ACE data do not show much agreement. The bipolar clouds are predominately S-N during cycle 21, yet ACE saw many N-S clouds in 1999 and 2000. The trend in the number of bipolar and unipolar clouds also seems to be in mild disagreement between the ACE and PVO data, their slopes look equal and opposite over the three years of solar maximum. For a more complete comparison of the solar cycle evolution, a much longer period of ACE data is needed and will be the subject of future work.

5. Plasma and Composition Spatial Structure

5.1. Spatial Mapping Procedure

Figure 8 depicts our general procedure for extracting composition spatial structure from the magnetic field model. The upper panel shows the spacecraft trajectory through the cloud projected onto the plane perpendicular to the cloud axis. Using the model geometry, we are able to associate any ACE measured quantity $Q(t)$ with a radial distance $\rho(t)$ inside the model cylinder. This defines a simple mapping to determine the spatial dependence, $Q(\rho(t))$. It is important to notice that the distances $\rho(t)$ from the axis in the projected spacecraft trajectory are always symmetric around the impact parameter $\rho_0$ of the model fit. We allow the mapping to be asymmetric by taking the distances earlier in time to be negative. The incoming half is $\rho < 0$ and the outgoing half is $\rho > 0$. This ensures that any consistent, structural differences between the leading and trailing halves of the events will be maintained during the profile averaging. This effect is demonstrated in the lower panel of Figure 8 where the spatial sampling starts at $\rho = -1$ and ends at $\rho = +1$. By applying this procedure to our entire set of cloud events we are able to construct a composite statistical average of a full diameter cut of any measured ACE quantity.

5.2. Results

Figure 9 is a collection of these diameter profiles for both slow and fast clouds. The slow cloud profiles are indicated by the dashed line connecting error bars and the fast cloud profiles are solid lines connecting triangles. We used 15 bins to divide the diameter cut and computed the average value in each bin. The vertical error bars are the standard deviation of the mean in each bin. The horizontal error bars represent the histogram bin width. The bin width is 0.133 of the normalized cloud radius and represents the maximum statistical scatter in radial distance in each bin. However, this 7% independent statistical error does not include the $\sim 20\%$ systematic model uncertainty of the parameter $\rho_0$ described in section 3.4. All of the major structural trends, particularly the relative levels of enhancement are still present when taking this systematic model error into account.

The bins closer to the cloud edges have more data points than the bins in the center of the cloud because of the mapping procedure. Owing to various gaps in the level 2 data (indicated on Table 1), the number of data points per bin are not symmetric in $\rho$ nor the same for the different quantities.
The spacecraft trajectory in the cloud frame, showing the positions of a measured quantity $Q(t)$ during the cloud event. (bottom) A plot of the inferred position structure, $Q(p(t))$, within the magnetic cloud. Notice the incoming/outgoing asymmetry remains intact and that time runs left to right along the $p$ axis. The $p$ axis is normalized by cloud radius, $R_c$, such that we can look for common structure among clouds of different sizes.

The first plot is the average radial velocity ($V_{rad}$). The slow cloud velocity profile has the typical shape characteristic of a magnetic cloud where the slight negative slope is due to the cloud expansion. The fast cloud velocity profile has the same large scale trend but is less smooth. This is an indication of fewer data points as well as a larger variability than the slow cloud events.

The proton temperature is essentially symmetric in $p$, with the fast clouds showing much more variation as well as a trend of being hotter toward their edges. The average dip seen in both the fast and slow profiles is most likely explained by the low proton temperature event selection criteria. A possibility for the stronger leading edge temperatures in the fast cloud profile may be the interaction with the slower upstream solar wind.

The proton density profiles appear to be almost symmetric. The slow clouds seem to show a smooth 20% decrease toward the center. The fast clouds are less dense throughout, decrease rapidly from the edges, and show a symmetric increase toward the center. The slow solar wind has an average $N_p \sim 10$ cm$^{-3}$ with considerable variation of around 40% [Schwenn, 1990]. The fast magnetic clouds are depleted compared to the “average” slow solar wind. This might be expected from the familiar anticorrelation between solar wind speed and density, however the internal structure is of more interest to us. While the error bars are fairly large, the fast cloud profile does seem to indicate a slightly denser center, consistent with the idea of an “average” three-part CME structure inferred from coronagraph observations [e.g., Illic and Hundhausen, 1986].

The alpha to proton ratio profiles are very similar for fast and slow events. The slow cloud $N_a/N_p$ ratio increase slowly toward the rear of the cloud. The fast cloud ratio increases, levels off and becomes more variable, meeting the slow cloud profile, and shows a prominent average spike at three-fourths of the way through the cloud. This spike is enhanced due to a particularly helium enriched event (day 268, 1998). Removing this contribution brings the bin average down to $\sim 0.08$, which becomes only a modest enhancement over the slow cloud value. The $N_a/N_p$ ratio is highly variable in the slow solar wind and ICME identification is usually based on $N_a/N_p > 0.08–0.10$ [Borrini et al., 1981, 1982]. While our “average” magnetic cloud profiles do not meet this enhancement criteria, certainly some individual events do so.

The oxygen and iron charge state classes are enhanced relative to long term averages over the highly variable slow solar wind. Zurbuchen et al. [2000] found $\langle O^{7+}/O^{6+} \rangle = 0.39 \pm 0.13$ in the slow solar wind. Lepri et al. [2001] found that extended periods of $Fe^{16+}/Fe_{total} \gtrsim 0.10$ had anywhere from an 80–100% overlap with ICME periods depending on the ICME identifying characteristics, e.g., bidirectional electrons. In the 2-hour iron data averages used by Lepri et al. the non-CME associated slow solar wind had $Fe^{16+}/Fe_{total}$ values that did not deviate statistically from zero.

The oxygen and iron charge state ratios have qualitatively different diameter profiles. On average, they both show that the faster clouds have higher charge states, but this is much less obvious in the $O^{7+}/O^{6+}$ profiles where the diameter average is $\sim 1.0$ for slow clouds and $\sim 1.5$ for fast clouds. Both of the $O^{7+}/O^{6+}$ profiles show significant variation. The large error bar on the $p = 0.5$ spike indicates a single anomalously high point dominating the bin average (also from the day 268, 1998 event). The $Fe^{16+}/Fe_{total}$ profiles show a relatively smooth, symmetric peak at the center of the cloud for the slow average profile, and perhaps a noisier version of the same trend for the fast profile. The differences between iron charge states are quite striking, especially compared to the similarities of the $N_a/N_p$ and $O^{7+}/O^{6+}$ profiles. The heavy oxygen and iron charge state ratios can be used to derive coronal electron temperatures for a given expansion time and spatial scales in the region of charge state freeze-in close to the Sun.

We have examined the robustness of these average profiles in light of the ability of a single event to weight bin averages in both the $N_a/N_p$ and $O^{7+}/O^{6+}$ profiles. We excluded all of the poor cylinder model fits ($x_{\Delta v} > 0.20$ in Table 1) and found that the plasma and composition profiles looked remarkably similar. This had the effect of removing 15 slow cloud events and 3 fast cloud events from the profile averages. All of the slow cloud profiles were essentially identical, with the largest change being an almost uniform decrease in the $N_p$ profile of $\sim 0.5$ cm$^{-3}$. The fast cloud average profile changes were within 1σ of the old values with the following exceptions. The central peak in the fast cloud $N_p$ profile became much less prominent but was still enhanced compared to the symmetric dips. The $O^{7+}/O^{6+}$ profile showed slightly more enhancement over the
slow cloud values and less variation in the first half of the profile.

6. Discussion

[53] We have presented the most complete set of ACE magnetic cloud observations to date. All of our results indicate a significant difference between slow and fast magnetic clouds. Magnetic cloud events are of particular interest because of their potential role in the large scale magnetic field evolution of the Sun and their implied constraints on the physical processes of flux rope CME origin.

[54] The faster clouds are not only characterized by marginally greater flux, but more importantly, they have different plasma and ionic composition signatures. The fast clouds have lower proton density and are more enhanced in N$_{\alpha}$/N$_p$ in the first half of the cloud. The oxygen and iron charge states are also increased throughout fast clouds, which is a good indication of a hotter coronal electron temperature. It appears that most of these features are related in a consistent way, having to do with overall

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure9}
\caption{Diameter cuts through composite statistical averages of the mean radial velocity $\langle V_{rad}\rangle$, proton temperature $T_p$, proton density $N_p$, the oxygen charge state ratio O$^{7+}$/O$^{6+}$, the alpha to proton ratio N$_{\alpha}$/N$_p$, and high iron charge state ratio Fe$^{26+}$/Fe$_{total}$. The $\rho$-axis is normalized cloud radius, with $\rho = -1.0$ indicating the incoming edge, $+1.0$ the outgoing edge. $\langle V_{rad}\rangle < 500$ km/s is plotted as a dashed line connecting the error bars, $\langle V_{rad}\rangle \geq 500$ km/s is plotted as solid line connecting triangles. The vertical error bars are the standard deviation of the mean in each bin, the horizontal error bars are the bin width.}
\end{figure}
energy of the solar environment of the CME origin. We observe more energy in fast clouds at 1 AU (both kinetic and magnetic) as well as evidence for a heated coronal environment.

[55] One obtains an estimate of the electron temperature in the corona from the heavy ion charge state observations by equating the expansion time scale to the equilibrium time scale of the individual ion species. This expansion time scale can be defined as a characteristic scale height divided by the velocity of the plasma near the Sun. To compare our slow and fast magnetic clouds we take 1 \( R_\odot \) as the scale height and velocity estimates typical of speeds inferred from coronagraph observations for the two types of CME acceleration profiles. In general, slow CMEs speed up and fast CMEs slow down, so the relationship between observed ICME speeds at 1 AU and coronagraph CME speeds is much more complicated than a simple one-to-one correspondence. A rigorous treatment must include the properties of the ambient solar wind and the interaction between the ejecta and this background. That being said, if we assume slow and fast coronagraph speeds of 200 km/s and 1000 km/s [e.g., Sheeley et al., 1999] are characteristic for our slow and fast magnetic cloud events near the Sun, then the electron temperatures from the diameter averaged \( O^+/O^{+2} \) ratios of 1.0 for slow clouds and 1.5 for fast clouds are \( \sim 2.0 \times 10^6 \) K and \( \sim 2.3 \times 10^6 \) K, respectively. These temperatures also correspond to freeze-in electron densities of \( \sim 1.3 \times 10^6 \) cm\(^{-3}\) for slow clouds and \( \sim 4.3 \times 10^6 \) cm\(^{-3}\) for fast clouds.

[56] The difference in electron temperature implies an increase of 15% in internal energy in fast magnetic clouds. However, these estimates assume a steady state flow speed which is not exactly applicable to transient events. A more complete treatment of the electron temperature and density inversions with realistic CME expansion timescales will be addressed in future work.

[57] Our results could be used to constrain some of the models currently being used to describe magnetic clouds and flux rope CMEs. There are two schools of thought on the origins of flux rope CMEs: either the helical flux rope structure was preexisting in quasi-equilibrium and erupted via some mechanism, or the helical flux rope structure was generated during the eruption process (see review by Klimchuk [2001]). Many of these models have been compared to white-light coronagraph images and there has been relatively good agreement in reproducing general CME features [e.g., Gibson and Low, 1998; Chen et al., 2000; Manchester et al., 2002]. However, if these CME events are also the magnetic clouds seen in the heliosphere, then the same simulations must also reproduce the observed spacecraft measurements.

[58] The quantities commonly simulated for comparison with in situ observations are the vector magnetic field, proton density and temperature, and cloud velocity. These tend to match the observed properties of magnetic clouds at least qualitatively [Wu et al., 1999; Krall et al., 2000; Linker et al., 2002]. In working toward quantitative agreement, composition profiles could be included in this convergence. This would challenge the models of CME initiation to produce electron temperatures and densities at the sun consistent with the observed ionic charge states in the interior of their erupting flux rope.

[59] The correct model should also describe the compositional differences between fast and slow magnetic clouds. There is a perhaps a precedence for two separate types of CMEs characterized by their velocity profiles in coronagraph observations and the location of their origin. Low and Zhang [2002] presented a theoretical framework for two topologically different origins having to do with the filament orientation polarity with respect to the background field. It is not obvious that the different resulting flux rope topologies from “inverse” and “normal” filament eruptions would evolve into the similar magnetic structures with differing plasma histories, as observed at 1 AU.

[60] It is important to remember that all of our spatial structure is derived from the application of the static, linear, force-free magnetic field model. To the extent that this model correctly describes the three-dimensional magnetic structure of the flux rope, our spatial structure is valid. The true \( \rho_0 \) parameter uncertainty, even rigorously defined, is still only an error within the framework of the assumed magnetic field model. While there exists a physical reason to believe the fields may be evolving toward a force-free state, by no means are we certain that “complete” internal reconnection has provided a linear force-free configuration by 1 AU.

[61] It would be interesting to compare similar spatial mapping analyses for different flux rope magnetic field models. One suspects that any symmetric model would yield similar results to those presented here. Some of the newer, more complicated models are not symmetric and thus probably better describe reality. For example, the Russell and Mulligan [2002] elliptical flux rope geometry has three different length scales and the flux rope solutions to the Grad-Shafranov equation using the spacecraft data as a boundary condition are neither symmetric nor force-free [Hu and Sonnerup, 2001]. It may be that a nonsymmetric spatial structure, derived from a complicated field model, would show many of the features presented here. However, it would be much harder to compare multiple events, or construct an average profile, if the physical geometry of the flux ropes were different every time.

7. Conclusion

[62] We have presented an analysis of 56 magnetic clouds events observed by the ACE spacecraft near the maximum of solar cycle 23. Applying the simplest static, linear, force-free magnetic field model and a successful fitting technique, we have shown general agreement with previous statistical surveys and their model parameter distributions. Using the geometry inherent in the static magnetic field model, we have mapped various plasma and composition quantities to a distance from the cylindrical model axis. This enabled us to build up mean composition distributions along the diameter of the model cylinder.

[63] The internal plasma and composition profiles suggest two classes or origins of magnetic clouds. We have motivated this analysis by briefly discussing the application of these results to the transport of toroidal magnetic flux by these well-ordered CMEs into the heliosphere. We have also suggested some constraints these compositional profiles could place on various aspects of the modern flux rope modeling effort. This includes coronal electron temperatures and densities required to reproduce our observed charge
states at 1 AU as well as the ability to generate two distinct classes of flux rope CMEs with almost identical magnetic topologies at 1 AU.
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