

泼 UNIVERSITY OF 

## The effect of magnetic field and density variations on particle acceleration in a 3D RCS

by Valentina V. Zharkova & Mykola Gordovskyy

http://kinetics.inf.brad.ac.uk

## **The outline**

- >Observational evidences of p and e presence
- Current sheet topology with a guiding magnetic field
- >The particle motion analysis in a 3D current sheet
  - **Case 1 Bz variable; case 2, Bz and Bx variable**
- Electron and proton energy spectra from an RCS with a constant density
- ➢E and p energy spectra from an model RCS with varying density and transversal magnetic field

#### The evidences of accelerated particles in flares

- Electrons (well established see talk by Fletcher): Bremsstrahlung hard X-ray emission; gyro-synchrotron MW-emission etc.
- Protons: ?-ray nuclear lines in some flares (Share et al, 2002-5).
   I m p l i c i t e v i d e n c e s: non-thermal UV-lines
   broadening and Ha impact polarisation
   (Antonucci et al, 1984; Henoux, Chambe et al, 1990)
   Hard bremsstrahlung X-ray (>20KeV) can be partly produced
   by proton-energized electrons (Simnett & Haines, 1990).

#### The mechanisms of particle acceleration

• Acceleration by electric field inside the reconnecting current sheet (*in upper corona*)

-Semi-analytical solutions of motion equation for particles in non-neutral CS

(Spieser, 1965; Litvinenko, 1996; Litvinenko & Somov, 1993, 1995; Zhu and Parks, 1993; Tsuneta, 1995).

-The numerical simulation of particles acceleration in 2D current sheet (Vlahos, 1989; Martens & Young, 1990) and 3D current sheet Zharkova & Gordovskyy, 2004, 2005; Woods & Neukirch, 2005; Dalla and Browning, 2005 ).

#### Acceleration by propagating plasma waves

(in lower atmospheric levels)

- Thermal electron acceleration by MHD-waves

(Park and Petrosian, 1995; Pryadko & Petrosian, 1997)

- Proton and electron acceleration by fast modes of MHD- waves (e.g. *Decker and Vlahos, 1986; Miller et al, 1996*)

#### Acceleration by MHD-shocks

(see e.g. Decker and Vlahos, 1986; Cargill et al., 1988; Anastasiadis and Vlahos, 1991)

#### **Observed asymmetry of the footpoint brightness**

➤ A spatial asymmetry between X-ray images of footpoints. The brighter X-ray source is often observed in the footpoint with weaker magnetic field (*Nitta et al., 1990; Sakao, 1994; Sakao et al, 1994*).

➤ A spatial asymmetry in MW images of the two separate footpoints was also observed in many flares. Unlike X-rays, the brighter MW footpoint corresponds to higher magnetic field (*Kundu et al., 1995, Masuda et al., 1996*).

> This effect was interpreted as a result of the different magnetic field convergence in different loop legs. The higher is the convergence the stronger is magnetic mirroring.

#### The temporal and spectral asymmetry in different footpoints

> In many flares, in addition to the brightness asymmetry, there is a spectral asymmetry in MW range: one footpoint has a power-law energy spectra while the other has the thermal one (e.g. *Takakura et al, 1995*).

➢ In some flares there is a temporal delay in MW and gamma-ray emission appearing in different footpoints (so called 'prolonged emission' appearing either prior or after the main phase (see e.g. Aschwanden, 1996; Aurass et al., 1999; Akimov et al., 1999, Share et al., 2003)

 $\succ$  These two types of asymmetry can not be interpreted by a different magnetic convergence in the flaring loops.

Time delays in  $\gamma$ -ray line emission can be as small as <2 sec to as large as 10's of sec.

γ-ray line emission in 2002 July 23 flare may be delayed by ~10 sec from hard X-rays.

What does this say about accelerationtransport? Could be accounted for by trapping or is it intrinsic to the acceleration process?





RHESSI Workshop, Paris, Apr '06

•Hence, the energy spectra and temporal asymmetry between footpoints can be caused by the **magnetic field topological effects** governing particle acceleration in the current sheet

## ß

This is the motivation to investigate proton and electron motions inside a 3D current sheet From Share and Murphy, 2004, RHESSI Workshop (Sonoma)

#### γ-RAY AND NEUTRON PRODUCTION IN SOLAR FLARES



# Case 1 Rx-Ry =const



(Zharkova&Gordovskyy, **MNRAS**, 2005)  $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{0}} \tanh(-\mathbf{x}/\mathbf{d})$  $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{0}} (\mathbf{z}/\mathbf{a})^{\mathbf{a}}$  $B_v = +/- By_0 = 0.0001Tl$  $B_0 = 0.01 Tl$  $E_{v0} = B_0 V_{inflow} - 1/s\mu dB_z/dx$  $V_{inflow} \approx 0.01 V_{alfven} \approx 10^4 m/s$  $E_{v0} = 100V/m$ 

aris, Apr '06

11

#### Accepted current sheet scheme – case 1 ( $B_x = B_y = const$ )



Accepted parameters of the particle motion: electrons



Accepted parameters of particle motion: protons



**The motion equation** of charged particles in the electric and magnetic fields:

$$\ddot{\mathbf{r}}(t) = q/m \left( \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}) + \left[ \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t) \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \right)$$

#### The method of calculations

 $\Box$  The particle-in-cell approach was used (10<sup>5</sup> particles)

The second order of accuracy Runge-Kutta method (predictor-corrector scheme)

 $\Box$  A time step for each sort of particles is much smaller than the correspondent gyro-period

 $\delta t \ll m/q | \mathbf{B} |^{-1}$ 

#### General analysis of the particle motion: trajectories Zharkova &Gorodvskyy, ApJ 2004

> Electric field is the force that governs a straightforward movement of accelerated particles along the Y-axis, so for a particle with the charge q the Y-component will have a velocity  $V_y$ 

 $V_v \gg q/m E_v t$ 

> Obeying the X-component of magnetic field, by Lorenz force, *particle is* rotated through the angle of ~90° before being ejected with:  $V_z \gg q/m V_y B_x t = q^2/m^2 E_y B_x t^2$ 

> The particle velocity  $V_x$  occurring owing to a gyration is defined by the Ycomponent of magnetic field and the Z-component of a particle velocity as follows:

$$V_x \approx q/m V_z B_y t \approx q^3/m^3 E_y B_x B_y t^3$$

#### **Proton trajectory (ApJ 2004**



#### **Electron trajectories (ApJ 2004**



Asymmetry rate (ApJ 2004)  $AR = [N_{p+} - N_{p-}) - (N_{e+} - N_{e-})]/$   $[N_{p+} - N_{p-}) + (N_{+} - N_{e-})]$ 



Analysis of the particle motion: acceleration time and path (Speiser, 1965; Martens and Young, 1990)
 ➢ Assuming that the particle is accelerated during about a period of its gyration around perpendicular component of magnetic field the acceleration time can be estimated as follows:

 $t = 2 \pi m/q B_x^{-1}$  (s)

> Then the acceleration path (here  $y_{ej}$ - $y_{inj}$ ) can be estimated as

$$p = 2 \pi^2 m/q E_y B_x^{-2}$$
 (m)

#### **Analysis of particle motion: energies**

(Speiser, 1965, MY90)

 $\triangleright$  Assuming that acceleration time and path to follow the formula above, the energy of accelerated particle can be estimated as:

 $e = \pi^2/2 m/q E_y^2 B_x^{-2}$ 

➢ Estimations of acceleration time and energy at ejection for protons and electrons are summarised in the table:

	t,s	e, eV	
$\mathbf{p}^+$	6.3 10-4	5 104	
e-	3.5 10-7	~10 <sup>2</sup>	

#### The suggested scheme of proton/electron acceleration and precipitation

Pure electron beams, compensated by return current, precipitate in 1s

> Proton beam compensated by proton-energised 'electrons precipitate about 10s

## Magnetic field topology - Case 2, By =const



(Zharkova&Gordovskyy, MNRAS, 2005)

 $B_{z} = B_{0} \tanh(-x/d)$   $B_{x} = B_{0} (z/a)^{a}$  $B_{y} = +/-By_{0} = 0.0001Tl$ 

 $B_0 = 0.01 \text{Tl}$  $E_{y0} = B_0 V_{inflow} - 1/\text{s}\mu \ dB_z/dx$ 

 $V_{inflow} \approx 0.01 V_{alfven} \approx 10^4 m/s$  I  $E_{y0} = 100 V/m$ 

aris, Apr '06

23

Table 2: Comparison of the acceleration times, energies and velocities found from the estimations and simulations

	Accel. time		Energy		$V_x$
	estimated	simulation	formula (10)	simulation	
	RCS thickness $d = 10 m$				
protons	$6.3  imes 10^{-4}$	$10^{-4} - 10^{-3}$	$5  imes 10^5$	$1 \times 10^5$	$4.5 \times 10^{6}$
electrons	$3.5  imes 10^{-7}$	$10^{-5}$ - $10^{-4}$	$\sim 10^2$	$3 \times 10^4$	$7 \times 10^{7}$
	RCS thickness $d = 100 m$				
protons	$6.3  imes 10^{-4}$	$10^{-4} - 10^{-3}$	$5  imes 10^5$	$2  imes 10^5$	$6.2  imes 10^{6}$
electrons	$3.5  imes 10^{-7}$	$10^{-5}$ - $10^{-4}$	$\sim 10^2$	$5 \times 10^4$	9 × 10 <sup>7</sup>

Zharkova and Gordovskyy, ApJ 2004

**Electron/proton motion in an RCS Zh& G, MNRAS, 2005**  $B = 10^{-4} T$ **Gyroradius** (m) **Gyroperiod** (s)  $3.6 \times 10^{-5}/6.5 \times 10^{-2}$ e = 100 eV0.33/14e = 10 keV $3.6 \times 10-5/6.5 \times 10^{-2}$  $3.3/1.4 \times 10^{2}$  $B = 10^{-2} \text{ T}$ **Gyroradius** (m) **Gyroperiod** (s)  $3.3 \times 10^{-3}/0.14$  $3.6 \times 10^{-7}/6.5 \times 10^{-4}$ e = 100 eV $3.6 \times 10^{-7}/6.5 \times 10^{-4}$ e = 10 eV $3.3 \times 10^{-2}/1.4$ 

Particle trajectories – case 2 (
$$E \sim B_x^{-2} \sim z^{-2}$$
)  
blue – RCS edge, green – close to X-point





## Particle velocity spectra at ejection protons (blue) and electrons (brown) Zh& G, MNRAS, 2005



Neutralised beams, AR<10<sup>-4</sup> Partially separated beams Fully separated beams, **AR>10-2** 

 $e_p \sim C E_y^2 / B_x^2 (1 + By/B_0)^{1/2}$  $E_{low}^p \sim E_y^2 / B_0^2 (1 + B_y/B_0)^{1/2}$ 





#### 7h & C MINDAG 2005

Energy spectra: p (left) and e (right)  $B_y=10^{-4}T$  (solid) vs  $B_y=10^{-2}T$  (dashed) Particle energy spectra from an RCS with density variations Zh& G, MNRAS, 2005 dN(z)/dz

 $dN/d e = \cdots$ 

d e[Bx(z), By, Ey]/dz

For a constant density:

 $dN/d e \sim A e^{-1.5}$  protons

 $dN/de \sim Be^{-2.0}$  electrons

Let us consider the RCS density  $N=N_0 (z/a)^L \exp(-Lz/a)$ 



#### Energy spectra $B_x = B_0(z/a)$ (L=1):

e (blue) and p (black)

upper panel – neutral, middle – semi-neutral,

lower – fully separated beams



## Case 3: Role of the transversal component $B_x = B_0 (z/a)^{\alpha}$ for L=1: - Zh&G, Space SciRev, 2006



## Role of the transversal component (L=1): $B_x = B_0 (z/a)^{\alpha}$ - electrons



#### Zharkova & Gordovskyy

Table II. The spectral indices  $\gamma$  of proton beams calculated for different exponential indices  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  of the  $B_x$  and density variations with z.

			х		
$\alpha$	0	1/2	1	2	3
0.5	2	2.5	3	4	5
1	1.5	1.75	2	2.5	3
2	1.25	1.38	1.5	1.75	2
3	1.17	1.25	1.33	1.5	1.67

Table III. The spectral indices  $\gamma$  of electron beams calculated for different exponential indices  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  of the  $B_x$  and density variations with z.

			~		
$\alpha$	0	1/2	1	2	3
0.5	3	4	5	7	9
1	2	2.5	3	4	5
2	1.5	1.75	2	2.5	3
з	1.33	1.5	1.67	2	2.33

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1+\lambda}{\alpha} \right) = \gamma_1 + \frac{\lambda}{2\alpha}.$$
 (27)

The electron spectral indices  $\gamma$  calculated for various  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  are presented in Table III.

The resulting spectral index for electrons is directly proportional to  $\lambda$  (the density index) and reversely proportional to  $\alpha$  (the  $B_x$  index) for a weak guiding field and to the doubled  $\alpha$  for the strong field. In general, the spectral indices  $\gamma$  for electron and proton beams are strongly increased with the increase of the index  $\lambda$  of density variations in a vicinity of the X-nullpoint. The increase of the index  $\alpha$  leads to a decrease of the resulting spectral index  $\gamma$  if  $\alpha \succeq 1$  and an increase of  $\gamma$  if  $0 < \alpha < 1$ .

#### Zh& G, SpSciRev, 2006

# Electron spectral indices G dependence on $\alpha$ and L

#### **Electrons**

G= 1+ L /(2  $\alpha$ ) – strong guiding field ( $\beta$  > 10<sup>-2</sup>)

 $G = \frac{1}{2}(1 + L/\alpha)$  – weak guiding field ( $\beta < 10^{-2}$ )

#### **Protons**

 $G = 1 + L/(2 \alpha)$  – any guiding field

## Conclusions

 Electrons and protons accelerated in a non-neutral RCS with weak longitudinal and transversal components of magnetic field are ejected separately into different halves from Bx=0 depending on the By sign.
 Particles can be accelerated to very high energies (MeVs for electrons, GeV for protons).

Particles leave a model RCS with power law energy spectra with the indices

- $G = 1 + L/(2 \alpha)$  (protons and electrons in strong guiding field)
- $G = \frac{1}{2}(1 + L/\alpha)$  (electrons in moderate and weak GF).
- **Indices can vary from 1.2 to 9 for some combinations of** L and  $\alpha$

The indices and lower energy cutoffs are dependent on the electric and magnetic field components and can be increased by 2-4 for another models.

This opens new perspectives for magnetic field diagnostics in solar

flares and geomagnetic tail from hard X-ray and G-ray spectral indices