

GEOPHYSICAL MONOGRAPH SERIES

AGU
ADVANCING EARTH
AND SPACE SCIENCE

Space Physics and Aeronomy Collection

Upper Atmosphere Dynamics and Energetics

Editors

Wenbin Wang

Yongliang Zhang

Collection Editors in Chief

Yongliang Zhang

Larry J. Paxton

WILEY

Geophysical Monograph Series

- 212 **The Early Earth: Accretion and Differentiation** *James Badro and Michael Walter (Eds.)*
- 213 **Global Vegetation Dynamics: Concepts and Applications in the MC1 Model** *Dominique Bachelet and David Turner (Eds.)*
- 214 **Extreme Events: Observations, Modeling and Economics** *Mario Chavez, Michael Ghil, and Jaime Urrutia-Fucugauchi(Eds.)*
- 215 **Auroral Dynamics and Space Weather** *Yongliang Zhang and Larry Paxton (Eds.)*
- 216 **Low-Frequency Waves in Space Plasmas** *Andreas Keiling, Dong- Hun Lee, and Valery Nakariakov (Eds.)*
- 217 **Deep Earth: Physics and Chemistry of the Lower Mantle and Core** *Hidekazu Terasaki and Rebecca A. Fischer (Eds.)*
- 218 **Integrated Imaging of the Earth: Theory and Applications** *Max Moorkamp, Peter G. Lelievre, Niklas Linde, and Amir Khan (Eds.)*
- 219 **Plate Boundaries and Natural Hazards** *Joao Duarte and Wouter Schellart (Eds.)*
- 220 **Ionospheric Space Weather: Longitude and Hemispheric Dependences and Lower Atmosphere Forcing** *Timothy Fuller- Rowell, Endawoke Yizengaw, Patricia H. Doherty, and Sunanda Basu (Eds.)*
- 221 **Terrestrial Water Cycle and Climate Change Natural and Human-Induced Impacts** *Qihong Tang and Taikan Oki (Eds.)*
- 222 **Magnetosphere-Ionosphere Coupling in the Solar System** *Charles R. Chappell, Robert W. Schunk, Peter M. Banks, James L. Burch, and Richard M. Thorne (Eds.)*
- 223 **Natural Hazard Uncertainty Assessment: Modeling and Decision Support** *Karin Riley, Peter Webley, and Matthew Thompson (Eds.)*
- 224 **Hydrodynamics of Time-Periodic Groundwater Flow: Diffusion Waves in Porous Media** *Joe S. Depner and Todd C. Rasmussen (Auth.)*
- 225 **Active Global Seismology** *Ibrahim Cemen and Yucel Yilmaz (Eds.)*
- 226 **Climate Extremes** *Simon Wang (Ed.)*
- 227 **Fault Zone Dynamic Processes** *Marion Thomas (Ed.)*
- 228 **Flood Damage Survey and Assessment: New Insights from Research and Practice** *Daniela Molinari, Scira Menoni, and Francesco Ballio (Eds.)*
- 229 **Water-Energy-Food Nexus – Principles and Practices** *P. Abdul Salam, Sangam Shrestha, Vishnu Prasad Pandey, and Anil K Anal (Eds.)*
- 230 **Dawn–Dusk Asymmetries in Planetary Plasma Environments** *Stein Haaland, Andrei Rounov, and Colin Forsyth (Eds.)*
- 231 **Bioenergy and Land Use Change** *Zhangcai Qin, Umakant Mishra, and Astley Hastings (Eds.)*
- 232 **Microstructural Geochronology: Planetary Records Down to Atom Scale** *Desmond Moser, Fernando Corfu, James Darling, Steven Reddy, and Kimberly Tait (Eds.)*
- 233 **Global Flood Hazard: Applications in Modeling, Mapping and Forecasting** *Guy Schumann, Paul D. Bates, Giuseppe T. Aronica, and Heiko Apel (Eds.)*
- 234 **Pre-Earthquake Processes: A Multidisciplinary Approach to Earthquake Prediction Studies** *Dimitar Ouzounov, Sergey Pulnits, Katsumi Hattori, and Patrick Taylor (Eds.)*
- 235 **Electric Currents in Geospace and Beyond** *Andreas Keiling, Octav Marghitu, and Michael Wheatland (Eds.)*
- 236 **Quantifying Uncertainty in Subsurface Systems** *Celine Scheidt, Lewis Li, and Jef Caers (Eds.)*
- 237 **Petroleum Engineering** *Moshood Sanni (Ed.)*
- 238 **Geological Carbon Storage: Subsurface Seals and Caprock Integrity** *Stephanie Vialle, Jonathan Ajo-Franklin, and J. William Carey (Eds.)*
- 239 **Lithospheric Discontinuities** *Huaiyu Yuan and Barbara Romanowicz (Eds.)*
- 240 **Chemostratigraphy Across Major Chronological Eras** *Alcides N.Sial, Claudio Gaucher, Muthuvairavasamy Ramkumar, and Valderez Pinto Ferreira (Eds.)*
- 241 **Mathematical Geoenergy: Discovery, Depletion, and Renewal** *Paul Pukite, Dennis Coyne, and Daniel Challou (Eds.)*
- 242 **Ore Deposits: Origin, Exploration, and Exploitation** *Sophie Decree and Laurence Robb (Eds.)*
- 243 **Kuroshio Current: Physical, Biogeochemical and Ecosystem Dynamics** *Takeyoshi Nagai, Hiroaki Saito, Koji Suzuki, and Motomitsu Takahashi (Eds.)*
- 244 **Geomagnetically Induced Currents from the Sun to the Power Grid** *Jennifer L. Gannon, Andrei Swidinsky, and Zhonghua Xu (Eds.)*
- 245 **Shale: Subsurface Science and Engineering** *Thomas Dewers, Jason Heath, and Marcelo Sánchez (Eds.)*
- 246 **Submarine Landslides: Subaqueous Mass Transport Deposits From Outcrops to Seismic Profiles** *Kei Ogata, Andrea Festa, and Gian Andrea Pini (Eds.)*
- 247 **Iceland: Tectonics, Volcanics, and Glacial Features** *Tamie J. Jovanelly*
- 248 **Dayside Magnetosphere Interactions** *Qiugang Zong, Philippe Escoubet, David Sibeck, Guan Le, and Hui Zhang (Eds.)*
- 249 **Carbon in Earth's Interior** *Craig E. Manning, Jung-Fu Lin, and Wendy L. Mao (Eds.)*
- 250 **Nitrogen Overload: Environmental Degradation, Ramifications, and Economic Costs** *Brian G. Katz*
- 251 **Biogeochemical Cycles: Ecological Drivers and Environmental Impact** *Katerina Dontsova, Zsuzsanna Balogh-Brunstad, and Gaël Le Roux (Eds.)*
- 252 **Seismoelectric Exploration: Theory, Experiments, and Applications** *Niels Grobbe, André Revil, Zhenya Zhu, and Evert Slob (Eds.)*
- 253 **El Niño Southern Oscillation in a Changing Climate** *Michael J. McPhaden, Agus Santoso, and Wenju Cai (Eds.)*
- 254 **Dynamic Magma Evolution** *Francesco Vetere (Ed.)*
- 255 **Large Igneous Provinces: A Driver of Global Environmental and Biotic Changes** *Richard. E. Ernst, Alexander J. Dickson, and Andrey Bekker (Eds.)*
- 256 **Coastal Ecosystems in Transition: A Comparative Analysis of the Northern Adriatic and Chesapeake Bay** *Thomas C. Malone, Alenka Malej, and Jadran Faganeli (Eds.)*
- 257 **Hydrogeology, Chemical Weathering, and Soil Formation** *Allen Hunt, Markus Egli, and Boris Faybishenko (Eds.)*
- 258 **Solar Physics and Solar Wind** *Nour E. Raouafi and Angelos Vourlidas (Eds.)*
- 259 **Magnetospheres in the Solar System** *Romain Maggiolo, Nicolas André, Hiroshi Hasegawa, and Daniel T. Welling (Eds.)*
- 260 **Ionosphere Dynamics and Applications** *Chaosong Huang and Gang Lu (Eds.)*
- 261 **Upper Atmosphere Dynamics and Energetics** *Wenbin Wang and Yongliang Zhang (Eds.)*
- 262 **Space Weather Effects and Applications** *Anthea J. Coster, Philip J Erickson, and Louis J Lanzerotti (Eds.)*

Space Physics and Aeronomy Collection Volume 4
Geophysical Monograph 261

Upper Atmosphere Dynamics and Energetics

Wenbin Wang
Yongliang Zhang
Editors

Yongliang Zhang
Larry J. Paxton
Collection Editors in Chief

This Work is a co-publication of the American Geophysical Union and John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

This edition first published 2021
© 2021 American Geophysical Union

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by law. Advice on how to obtain permission to reuse material from this title is available at <http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions>.

The right of Wenbin Wang and Yongliang Zhang to be identified as the editor of this work has been asserted in accordance with law.

Published under the aegis of the AGU Publications Committee

Brooks Hanson, Executive Vice President, Science
Carol Frost, Chair, Publications Committee
For details about the American Geophysical Union visit us at www.agu.org.

Registered Office

John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

Editorial Office

111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at www.wiley.com.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some content that appears in standard print versions of this book may not be available in other formats.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty

While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this work, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives, written sales materials or promotional statements for this work. The fact that an organization, website, or product is referred to in this work as a citation and/or potential source of further information does not mean that the publisher and authors endorse the information or services the organization, website, or product may provide or recommendations it may make. This work is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a specialist where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Wang, Wenbin (Atmospheric scientist), editor. | Zhang, Yongliang,
1963– editor. | John Wiley & Sons, Inc., publisher. | American
Geophysical Union, publisher.

Title: Upper atmosphere dynamics and energetics / Wenbin Wang, Yongliang
Zhang, editors.

Description: Hoboken, NJ : Wiley-American Geophysical Union, [2021] |

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020038741 | ISBN 9781119507567 (cloth) | ISBN 9781119815563 (adobe pdf) | ISBN
9781119815556 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Atmospheric circulation. | Upper atmosphere. | Dynamic
climatology.

Classification: LCC QC880.4.A8 U55 2021 | DDC 551.51/45–dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2020038741>

Cover Design: Wiley

Cover Image: Courtesy of Stanley C. Solomon, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA

Set in 10/12pt Times New Roman by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India

CONTENTS

List of Contributors	vii
----------------------------	-----

Preface	xi
---------------	----

Part I Energetics and Dynamics of the Upper Atmosphere

1 Joule Heating in the Thermosphere <i>Arthur D. Richmond</i>	3
2 Momentum and Energy Budgets in the High-Latitude Lower Thermospheric Wind System <i>Young-Sil Kwak and Arthur D. Richmond</i>	19
3 Upper Thermospheric Winds: Forcing, Variability, and Effects <i>Wenbin Wang, Alan G. Burns, and Jing Liu</i>	41
4 Influence of Nonhydrostatic Processes on the Ionosphere-Thermosphere <i>Yue Deng, Cissi Y. Lin, Qingyu Zhu, and Cheng Sheng</i>	65
5 The Middle- and Low-Latitude Neutral Wind Dynamo <i>Astrid Maute</i>	79

Part II Upper Atmospheric Composition

6 Neutral Composition in the Upper Atmosphere <i>Alan G. Burns, Wenbin Wang, and Liying Qian</i>	107
7 Storm-Time Neutral Composition Changes in the Upper Atmosphere <i>Yongliang Zhang and Larry J. Paxton</i>	115
8 Neutral Hydrogen in the Terrestrial Thermosphere and Exosphere: A Ground-Based Perspective <i>Edwin Mierkiewicz</i>	135

Part III Low and Upper Atmosphere Coupling Through Waves

9 Atmosphere-Ionosphere (A-I) Coupling by Solar and Lunar Tides <i>Jeffrey M. Forbes</i>	159
10 Planetary Waves and Their Impact on the Mesosphere, Thermosphere, and Ionosphere <i>Jia Yue, Ruth Lieberman, and Loren C. Chang</i>	183
11 Longitudinal Variation in the Mass Density of the Thermosphere: A GAIA Simulation <i>Yasunobu Miyoshi</i>	217

Part IV Upper Atmosphere Structure and Variability

12 Equatorial Thermosphere Anomaly <i>Jiuhou Lei</i>	229
13 Structured Storm-Time Polar Ionosphere and Its Drivers: A Review <i>Jing Liu, Wenbin Wang, Alan G. Burns, and Qinghe Zhang</i>	239
14 Solar Flare Effects on the Thermosphere and Ionosphere <i>Liying Qian and Thomas N. Woods</i>	253
15 Day-to-Day Variability of the Thermosphere and Ionosphere <i>Huixin Liu, Yosuke Yamazaki, and Jiuhou Lei</i>	275
16 Response of the Ionosphere to Varying Solar Fluxes <i>Libo Liu, Yiding Chen, and Huijun Le</i>	301
17 Long-Term Trends in the Upper Atmosphere <i>Jan Laštovička</i>	325

Part V Upper Atmosphere Data Assimilation

18 Inference of Hidden States by Coupled Thermosphere-Ionosphere Data Assimilation: Applications to Observability and Predictability of Neutral Mass Density <i>Tomoko Matsuo and Chih-Ting Hsu</i>	345
---	-----

Part VI Upper Atmosphere Observations

19 The Ground-Based Airglow Imager Network in China: Recent Observational Results <i>Jiyao Xu, Qinzeng Li, Longchang Sun, Xiao Liu, Wei Yuan, Wenbin Wang, Jia Yue, Shunrong Zhang, Weijun Liu, Guoying Jiang, Kun Wu, Hong Gao, and Chang Lai</i>	367
20 MLT Science Enabled by Atmospheric Lidars <i>Chiao-Yao She, Alan Z. Liu, Tao Yuan, Jia Yue, Tao Li, Chao Ban, and Jonathan S. Friedman</i>	395
21 Remote Sensing of Magnetic Fields Induced by Electrojets From Space: Measurement Techniques and Sensor Design <i>Jeng-Hwa Yee, Jesper Gjerloev, and Dong Wu</i>	451
22 Remote Sensing of Global Lower Thermospheric Winds: Sensing Techniques and Sensor Design <i>Jeng-Hwa Yee, Imran Mehdi, Darren Hayton, Jose Siles, and Dong Wu</i>	469
23 Exploring the Upper Atmosphere: Using Optical Remote Sensing <i>Larry J. Paxton, Yongliang Zhang, Hyosub Kil, and Robert K. Schaefer</i>	487
Index	523

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Chao Ban

Key Laboratory of Middle Atmosphere and Global
Environment Observation
Institute of Atmospheric Physics
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Alan G. Burns

High Altitude Observatory
National Center for Atmospheric Research
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Loren C. Chang

Department of Space Science and Engineering
Center for Astronautical Physics and Engineering
National Central University
Taoyuan, Taiwan

Yiding Chen

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

and

Mohe Observatory of Geophysics
Institute of Geology and Geophysics
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China;

and

College of Earth and Planetary Sciences
University of the Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China;

and

Beijing National Observatory of Space Environment
Institute of Geology and Geophysics
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Yue Deng

Department of Physics
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas, USA

Jeffrey M. Forbes

Ann and H.J. Smead Department of Aerospace
Engineering Sciences
College of Engineering & Applied Science
University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Jonathan S. Friedman

Puerto Rico Photonics Institute
Universidad Ana G. Mendez-Cupey Campus
San Juan, Puerto Rico

Hong Gao

State Key Laboratory of Space Weather
National Space Science Center
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Jesper Gjerloev

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
Laurel, Maryland, USA

Darren Hayton

Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Pasadena, California, USA

Chih-Ting Hsu

High Altitude Observatory
National Center for Atmospheric Research
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Guoying Jiang

State Key Laboratory of Space Weather
National Space Science Center
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Hyosub Kil

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
Laurel, Maryland, USA

Young-Sil Kwak

Space Science Division
Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute
Daejeon, South Korea;

and

Department of Astronomy and Space Science
Korea University of Science and Technology
Daejeon, South Korea

Chang Lai

School of Science
Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications
Chongqing, China

Jan Laštovička

Institute of Atmospheric Physics
Czech Academy of Sciences
Prague, Czech Republic

Huijun Le

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

and

Innovation Academy for Earth Science
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China;

and

Mohe Observatory of Geophysics
Institute of Geology and Geophysics
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China;

and

College of Earth and Planetary Sciences
University of the Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Jiuhou Lei

CAS Key Laboratory of Geospace Environment
School of Earth and Space Sciences
University of Science and Technology of China
Hefei, China

Qinzeng Li

State Key Laboratory of Space Weather
National Space Science Center
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Tao Li

University of Science and Technology of China
Hefei, China

Ruth Lieberman

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, Maryland, USA

Cissi Y. Lin

Department of Physics
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas, USA

Alan Z. Liu

Center for Space and Atmospheric Research
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Daytona Beach, Florida, USA;

and

Department of Physical Sciences
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Daytona Beach, Florida, USA

Huixin Liu

Department of Earth and Planetary Science
Kyushu University
Fukuoka, Japan

Jing Liu

Institute of Space Sciences
Shandong University
Weihai, China

Libo Liu

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

and

Innovation Academy for Earth Science
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China;

and

Mohe Observatory of Geophysics
Institute of Geology and Geophysics
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China;

and

College of Earth and Planetary Sciences
University of the Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Weijun Liu

State Key Laboratory of Space Weather
National Space Science Center
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Xiao Liu

School of Mathematics and Information Science
Henan Normal University
Xinxiang, China

Tomoko Matsuo

Ann and H.J. Smead Department of Aerospace
Engineering Sciences
College of Engineering & Applied Science
University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Astrid Maute

High Altitude Observatory
National Center for Atmospheric Research
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Imran Mehdi

Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Pasadena, California, USA

Edwin Mierkiewicz

Department of Physical Sciences and Center for Space
and Atmospheric Research
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Daytona Beach, Florida, USA

Yasunobu Miyoshi

Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences
Kyushu University
Fukuoka, Japan

Larry J. Paxton

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
Laurel, Maryland, USA

Liying Qian

High Altitude Observatory
National Center for Atmospheric Research
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Arthur D. Richmond

High Altitude Observatory
National Center for Atmospheric Research
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Robert K. Schaefer

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
Laurel, Maryland, USA

Chiao-Yao She

Department of Physics
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado, USA

Cheng Sheng

Department of Physics
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas, USA

Jose Siles

Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Pasadena, California, USA

Longchang Sun

State Key Laboratory of Space Weather
National Space Science Center
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Wenbin Wang

High Altitude Observatory
National Center for Atmospheric Research
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Thomas N. Woods

Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics
University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Dong Wu

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, Maryland, USA

Kun Wu

State Key Laboratory of Space Weather
National Space Science Center
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China;
and

School of Astronomy and Space Science
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Jiyao Xu

State Key Laboratory of Space Weather
National Space Science Center
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China;
and

School of Astronomy and Space Science
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Yosuke Yamazaki

GFZ German Research Centre for Geosciences
Potsdam, Germany

Jeng-Hwa Yee

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
Laurel, Maryland, USA

Tao Yuan

Department of Physics, *and*
Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences
Utah State University
Logan, Utah, USA

Wei Yuan

State Key Laboratory of Space Weather
National Space Science Center
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China

Jia Yue

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, Maryland, USA;

and

Catholic University of America
Washington DC, USA

Qinghe Zhang

Institute of Space Sciences
Shandong University
Weihai, China

Shunrong Zhang

MIT Haystack Observatory
Westford, Massachusetts, USA

Yongliang Zhang

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
Laurel, Maryland, USA

Qingyu Zhu

Department of Physics
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas, USA

PREFACE

Earth's upper atmosphere is an open system that is strongly influenced by energy and momentum inputs from above (including solar radiation, solar wind, the magnetosphere) and from below by coupling with the lower atmosphere through large-scale waves. The upper atmosphere is a weakly ionized plasma. The neutral part is the "thermosphere" and the ionized part is the "ionosphere." The upper-atmosphere plasma is largely produced by photoionization of neutral species by solar extreme ultraviolet radiation. The thermosphere and ionosphere are strongly coupled together through ion-neutral interactions, including heat and momentum transfer and the effects of the so-called wind dynamo. The solar wind and magnetosphere affect the upper atmosphere through Joule heating and ion drag by imposing external electric fields and auroral particle precipitation during magnetically active periods. Changes in solar radiation on different timescales, ranging from transient events, such as solar flares or even an eclipse, to day-to-day variability due to the rotation of the Earth and Sun and the 11-year solar cycle, introduce variability in the global wind field. Furthermore, lower atmospheric waves, by propagating upward and depositing energy and momentum in the upper atmosphere, modify the circulation pattern, vertical thermal structure, dynamo electric fields, and neutral composition. Advances in our understanding of the upper atmosphere dynamics and chemical processes also benefit from new techniques that probe the state and variability of the upper atmosphere. Understanding the system drivers enables a more accurate space weather nowcast and forecast, which is critical for the safe conduct of human space activity.

This book is divided into six parts. Each part provides a state-of-the-art summary of knowledge in one specific aspect of the dynamics and energetics of the upper atmosphere system and its variability. The sum of the parts gives a comprehensive picture of our current understanding of this coupled system, its response to external drivers, as well as challenges and future research directions. Part I focuses on the momentum and energy budget of the global thermosphere and ionosphere system, and the dynamics and electrodynamics of this

system. Part II reviews neutral composition, including changes in the distribution of major species during geomagnetic storms, as well as the observation of the light species such as hydrogen in geocorona. Part III addresses the coupling of large-scale lower atmosphere waves (tides and planetary waves) with the upper atmosphere and its effects on the state of both the thermosphere and ionosphere. Part IV presents the structure and variability of the upper atmosphere, including effects of solar transients such as flares, day-to-day variability, and long-term changes induced by the secular variations of Earth magnetic field, and the increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gases. Part V describes the application of data assimilation for upper atmospheric reanalysis and forecast. Part VI covers optical remote sensing of the upper atmosphere from both ground and space and the prospects for future measurements.

This book provides an overview of the advances in some key areas of scientific research and measurement techniques of the upper atmosphere; promotes ideas to address still challenging scientific issues; and points to future directions for furthering our data analysis, modeling, and measurement capabilities. We hope that the readers from graduate students to early career research scientists will be inspired to gain an in-depth insight into the interconnection between different areas of upper atmospheric science, and a comprehensive and better understanding of the complexity and the nonlinearity of the dynamic coupling between the neutral and ionized gases, the effects of electromagnetic processes on the coupled system, and the response of this system to external driving conditions. We also intend this book to provide state-of-the-art information on both upper-atmospheric measurements and first-principles modeling for researchers seeking to improve and extend their knowledge of the field.

Wenbin Wang

National Center for Atmospheric Research, USA

Yongliang Zhang

*The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics
Laboratory, USA*

Part I

Energetics and Dynamics of the Upper Atmosphere

Joule Heating in the Thermosphere

Arthur D. Richmond

ABSTRACT

High-latitude Joule heating is an important energy source for thermospheric dynamics and composition. It is influenced by winds, plasma turbulence, variable electric fields, and conductivity modifications by strong electric fields. The height-integrated heating can be estimated from the Poynting flux above the ionosphere. Most energy is deposited near the morning and afternoon/evening sides of the auroral oval and in the cusp region. Multi-instrument data assimilation can help quantify complex spatial/temporal variations of Joule heating. Rapid changes of heating launch gravity waves that propagate globally. Within several hours, a global circulation sets up that reduces horizontal variations of the pressure scale height, causing spatial correlation between the temperature and the mean molecular mass. The distributions of temperature and density in the upper thermosphere often show little relation to the distribution of Joule heating. Vertical winds decrease the O/N_2 ratio in regions of heating and increase the ratio in regions of subsidence. The upper thermosphere is affected more strongly by the fraction of Joule heating deposited above 150 km than by the larger amount of Joule heating deposited below 150 km.

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Joule heating, which is the irreversible conversion of electromagnetic energy into heat through ohmic currents, is a significant source of energy for the high-latitude thermosphere (Cole, 1962; Thayer, 2000; Lu et al., 2016). Unlike heating by solar ultraviolet and extreme ultraviolet radiation, Joule heating occurs over only a small fraction of the Earth, and can drive large vertical velocities that alter the thermospheric circulation, leading to local and global temperature increases and changes in the structure of thermospheric composition, temperature, and density (e.g., Taeusch et al., 1971; Mayr & Volland, 1972, 1973; Mayr et al., 1978; Volland, 1979; Roble et al., 1983; Rees & Fuller-Rowell, 1989; Rees,

1995; Liu & Lühr, 2005; Sutton et al., 2005; Lei et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2010; Fedrizzi et al., 2012; Fuller-Rowell, 2013). Thermospheric responses to Joule heating during magnetic storms can be dramatic (e.g., Prölss, 1980, 1995; Rishbeth, 1991; Fuller-Rowell et al., 1994, 1997; Rees, 1995; Lu et al., 2016; Deng et al., 2018). In addition to temperature increases, which produce large density increases in the upper thermosphere, the upwelling in the high-latitude region of heating induces a global circulation within several hours (Volland & Mayr, 1971; Mayr & Volland, 1973), accompanied by downwelling at lower latitudes. The circulation dampens the upper-thermosphere density response at high latitudes and spreads this response globally. The upwelling decreases the O/N_2 ratio at high latitudes (Taeusch et al., 1971; Mayr & Volland, 1972; Lu et al., 2016). Rapid variations of the heating generate thermospheric gravity waves in the lower thermosphere that propagate globally into the

High Altitude Observatory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Space Physics and Aeronomy Collection Volume 4: Upper Atmosphere Dynamics and Energetics, Geophysical Monograph 261, First Edition.
 Edited by Wenbin Wang and Yongliang Zhang.

© 2021 American Geophysical Union. Published 2021 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

DOI: 10.1002/9781119815631.ch1

upper thermosphere, causing oscillations of wind, temperature, composition, and density as well as large-scale traveling ionospheric disturbances (e.g., Wright, 1960; Lu et al., 2016). The effects of Joule heating depend not only on its highly variable intensity and its distribution over the polar regions, but also on the altitude distribution of the heating. Effects observed in the upper thermosphere have a complex relation to the heating distribution, such that thermospheric density increases usually do not coincide with regions of maximum heat input, due not only to the presence of gravity waves, but also to the fact that circulation changes rapidly redistribute density (Johnson, 1960). Furthermore, temperature changes are coupled to composition changes, such that the temperature and the thermospheric O/N_2 ratio tend to be inversely correlated in space. This is due to the tendency of the circulation to smooth out horizontal variations of the pressure scale height (Hays et al., 1973). This effect contributes to the fact that horizontal variations of density and composition during magnetic storms can be very different (e.g., Lei et al., 2010).

1.2. PHYSICS OF JOULE HEATING

The physics of thermospheric Joule heating involves collisional interactions among electrons, positive ions, and neutral molecules. These species have differential bulk motions owing to the presence of electric and magnetic fields, so that collisions result in frictional momentum exchange and heating (e.g., Brekke & Kamide, 1996; Thayer & Semeter, 2004; Zhu et al., 2005; Vasyliunas & Song, 2005; Strangeway, 2012). The sum of frictional heating of all species gives the total Joule heating. The frictional heating causes the species to have different temperatures, with the electron and ion temperatures exceeding the neutral temperature (e.g., St. Maurice & Hanson, 1982; Heelis & Coley, 1988; St. Maurice et al., 1999), and additional collisions transfer heat from hotter to cooler species. On timescales longer than the heat-transfer times between ions and neutrals and between electrons and ions, and neglecting heat loss through conduction, radiation, or chemistry, a quasi-steady state is reached in which the heat is shared among the species in proportion to their number densities and particle degrees of freedom (three degrees of freedom for each particle plus two internal degrees of freedom for molecules), multiplied by their respective temperatures. Because the number density of neutral particles greatly exceeds the density of ions and electrons, almost all of the heat ends up residing in the neutral component of the gas.

For quasi-steady-state motions, the volumetric total frictional or Joule heating rate is represented by equation (1.1):

$$Q = Nm_i \nu_{in} (\mathbf{V}_i - \mathbf{V}_n)^2 + Nm_e \nu_{en} (\mathbf{V}_e - \mathbf{V}_n)^2 + Nm_e \nu_{ei} (\mathbf{V}_e - \mathbf{V}_i)^2 \quad (1.1)$$

where N is the electron (and ion) number density; m_i and m_e are the ion and electron masses; ν_{in} , ν_{en} , and ν_{ei} are the ion-neutral, electron-neutral, and electron-ion collision frequencies for momentum transfer (assumed here to be isotropic); and $\mathbf{V}_i$, $\mathbf{V}_n$, and $\mathbf{V}_e$ are the vector ion, neutral, and electron bulk velocities. Because $m_i \nu_{in}$ is much larger than $m_e \nu_{en}$ and $m_e \nu_{ei}$, ion-neutral collisions usually dominate Joule heating, except sometimes at low altitudes where these collisions cause the ion-neutral velocity difference ($\mathbf{V}_i - \mathbf{V}_n$) to become very small. Electron-neutral collisions become important in the lower E-region ionosphere, where Joule heating is relatively small except where strong turbulent electric fields can be present (see section 1.4). The contribution of electron-ion collisions to total Joule heating is insignificant.

By solving the momentum equations for ions and electrons to get their velocities in terms of the neutral wind $\mathbf{V}_n$ and the vector electric field components $\mathbf{E}_\perp$ and $\mathbf{E}_\parallel$ perpendicular and parallel to the geomagnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ (ignoring the small gravitational and pressure-gradient forces on the plasma), we can obtain Ohm's law for the vector current density $\mathbf{J}$ using equation (1.2):

$$\mathbf{J} = Ne(\mathbf{V}_i - \mathbf{V}_e) = \sigma_P (\mathbf{E}_\perp + \mathbf{V}_n \times \mathbf{B}) + \sigma_H \mathbf{b} \times (\mathbf{E}_\perp + \mathbf{V}_n \times \mathbf{B}) + \sigma_\parallel \mathbf{E}_\parallel \quad (1.2)$$

where σ_P , σ_H , and $\sigma_\parallel$ are the Pedersen, Hall, and parallel conductivities and $\mathbf{b}$ is a unit vector along $\mathbf{B}$. In terms of these quantities, the total Joule heating rate can also be expressed as equation (1.3):

$$Q = \mathbf{J} \cdot (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{V}_n \times \mathbf{B}) = \sigma_P (\mathbf{E}_\perp + \mathbf{V}_n \times \mathbf{B})^2 + \sigma_\parallel E_\parallel^2. \quad (1.3)$$

The total electromagnetic energy transfer rate to the medium is (equation (1.4)):

$$\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{J} \cdot (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{V}_n \times \mathbf{B}) + \mathbf{V}_n \cdot \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B} = Q + \mathbf{V}_n \cdot \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B} \quad (1.4)$$

where $\mathbf{J}$ is the electric current density. While Q on the right-hand side of (1.4) is always positive, the second term, representing the rate of work done on the medium by the Ampère force, can be either positive or negative.

The work may result in adiabatic changes of bulk kinetic energy, internal energy, and potential energy.

1.3. WIND EFFECTS ON JOULE HEATING

When $V_i - V_n$ is large enough to produce significant Joule heating, in regions where $Nm\nu_{in}$ is sufficiently large, it is usually because the magnitude of V_i becomes much larger than the magnitude of V_n . A rough estimate of Joule heating can be obtained by neglecting V_n altogether. However, V_n is often large enough to affect Joule heating substantially (Brekke & Rino, 1978; Thayer & Vickrey, 1992; Lu et al., 1995; Thayer et al., 1995; Thayer, 1998, 2000; Fujii et al., 1999; Deng & Ridley, 2007; Aikio et al., 2012; Cai et al., 2013, 2014; Hurd & Larsen, 2016; Billett et al., 2018). Billett et al. (2018) used empirical models of ion convection, wind, and conductivity to show that winds usually increase Joule heating in the dawn-side auroral region, but usually decrease Joule heating in the polar cap and dusk-side auroral region. In the auroral zone E region, Fujii et al. (1999) found that, on the average, winds reduce Joule heating by 35% at 125 km and by 10% at 117 km, but that winds contribute positively to Joule heating at 109 km and 101 km. In the lower thermosphere, Thayer (1998) and Hurd and Larsen (2016) found that height-varying winds have a strong influence on the height structure of Joule heating. Aikio et al. (2012) analyzed the statistics of the height-integrated Joule heating and generation of wind kinetic energy at the EISCAT Tromsø radar between 80 km and 180 km for different magnetic local times (MLTs) and K_p levels, while Cai et al. (2013) analyzed the height variations of these quantities. They found that the wind usually increases Joule heating relative to what it would be with the same electric field and conductivity, although a wind-induced decrease of Joule heating often occurs above 120 km, especially in the afternoon and evening.

It is important to recognize that the wind is not independent of the ion velocity but is strongly influenced by it (e.g., Axford & Hines, 1961; Cole, 1962; Rees, 1971; Rees & Fuller-Rowell, 1991; Fujii et al., 1999). When ion densities are large, as in the sunlit F region, ion drag tends to accelerate the wind toward the ion velocity on timescales ranging roughly from 3 h (ion density 10^{11} m^{-3}) down to 20 min (ion density 10^{12} m^{-3}), although this ion drag competes with other forces on the air, so that the velocity difference does not disappear. Rees and Fuller-Rowell (1991) pointed out that the reduction of the ion-neutral velocity difference by ion-drag-driven winds means that electric current densities and Joule heating are also reduced. Steady ion velocities have a

larger impact than rapidly varying ion velocities, if the latter do not persist long enough to accelerate the air very much. In the upper E region, Thayer (1998) found that winds produced by steady electric fields tend to reduce Joule heating, but that winds in the presence of variable electric fields tend to increase Joule heating, on average. In the latter case, the increase of Joule heating at times when V_i and V_n are opposed is greater than the reduction of Joule heating at times when V_i and V_n are in the same direction, for equal magnitudes of V_n , because of the quadratic relation of Joule heating to the velocity difference, yielding a net increase of Joule heating on average.

1.4. EFFECTS OF IRREGULARITIES AND ELECTRIC-FIELD VARIABILITY

When global estimates of Joule heating are needed, studies often use empirical models of electric fields together with conductivities derived from empirical models of solar ionizing radiation and auroral particle precipitation. These models are usually good at representing the average large-scale electric field and conductivity for specific geophysical conditions: magnetic latitude, MLT, season, interplanetary magnetic field (IMF), or other quantities. However, they typically do not represent the variability of electric fields, currents, and conductivities about the average. Variability on spatial scales smaller than the smoothed empirical models can occur on scales ranging from small-scale plasma waves to structures with scale sizes of tens or hundreds of kilometers. The requirement that electric current is essentially continuous everywhere means that irregularities in the conductivity engender irregularities in the electric field to maintain current continuity.

Plasma instabilities produce plasma waves with fractional electron-density fluctuations that can reach 10% or more of the background electron density (e.g., Oppenheim et al., 2008). Because of Hall polarization effects, these electron-density fluctuations can produce small-scale electric fields several times larger than the large-scale background electric field. Moreover, the irregularities tend to produce small-scale electric fields parallel to $\mathbf{B}$ that can be orders of magnitude larger than the average parallel electric field (e.g., St. Maurice & Laher, 1985; Providakes et al., 1988; St. Maurice, 1990; Dimant & Milikh, 2003; Milikh & Dimant, 2003), which can raise the electron temperature significantly (e.g., Bahcivan, 2007). Both the enhanced perpendicular electric field and the strongly enhanced parallel electric field increase the mean Joule heating (e.g., Dimant & Oppenheim, 2011a). Heelis and Vickrey (1991) pointed out that even without

irregularities in the plasma density, small-scale irregular structures in the electric field above the ionosphere also affect the strengths of the perpendicular and parallel electric field in the ionosphere below, and therefore affect the Joule heating.

Variance of the perpendicular electric field on scales greater than several kilometers can be comparable to the squared mean field (e.g., Codrescu et al., 1995, 2000; Crowley & Hackert, 2001; Matsuo et al., 2003; Matsuo & Richmond, 2008; Cosgrove & Thayer, 2006; Cosgrove et al., 2011; Hurd & Larsen, 2016), but only part of the observed variance is associated with irregular plasma structures, as opposed to temporal variability of the large-scale electric field. Crowley and Hackert (2001) showed that much of the temporal variability occurs with periods less than 1 h. Matsuo and Richmond (2008) analyzed the electric-field variability about the mean model of Weimer (2001) in terms of “resolved” and “subgrid” components, where the “subgrid” component essentially included wavelengths of 8–1,000 km along polar passes of the DE-2 satellite. The “subgrid” component is considerably stronger in winter than summer, but has little dependence on the IMF direction. The “resolved” component has less seasonal variation but is notably stronger for southward IMF than other IMF directions. Matsuo and Richmond (2008) found that the thermospheric wind response to the variable electric field depends significantly on its temporal coherence. Cosgrove and Codrescu (2009) discussed how the magnitude of electric-field variability depends on how the mean electric field is defined for particular geophysical conditions. They proposed a way of defining “small-scale” vs. “resolved-scale” electric-field variability, which was used by Cosgrove et al. (2011) to quantify the electric-field variance for these two scales. Cosgrove et al. (2011) found that “small-scale” electric-field variance is roughly 20% as large as the squared mean field, while “resolved-scale” variance is roughly 50% as large as the squared mean field. The contribution of electric-field variance to total Joule heating and its thermosphere/ionosphere effects can be substantial (e.g., Fuller-Rowell et al., 2000; Rodger et al., 2001; Codrescu et al., 2008; Matsuo & Richmond, 2008; Deng et al., 2009).

1.5. CONDUCTIVITY RELATION TO ELECTRIC FIELD

When modeling Joule heating from measured or modeled electric fields or currents together with modeled conductivities, it is important to have the spatial structures of the electric fields and conductivities properly matched. There can exist spatial/temporal correlations between the electric field and conductivity that affect the calculation

of total Joule heating. From an analysis of EISCAT electric field and conductance measurements around the March equinox, Aikio and Selkälä (2009) found that the Pedersen conductance can be either positively or negatively correlated with the electric-field strength, depending on MLT and K_p level, and that this correlation affects the calculation of Joule heating. Cosgrove et al. (2011) similarly found both positive and negative correlations between the conductance and electric-field strength in their analysis of Sondrestrom radar data. Based on analysis of spacecraft data, Zhu et al. (2018) quantified how positive and negative correlations between small- and meso-scale structures in electric fields and auroral electron precipitation affect height-integrated Joule heating.

As noted by Milikh et al. (2006) and Dimant and Oppenheim (2011b), modeling of conductivities in the E region can also be affected by electron temperature increases due to Farley-Buneman turbulence, owing to the inverse dependence of the ion-electron recombination rate on electron temperature (Schlegel, 1982). In the F region, the conductivity can be reduced by strong electric fields that heat the ions and increase their loss rate (Schunk et al., 1976). Meridional $E \times B$ drifts have an upward or downward component that raises or lowers the F region. This decreases or increases the height-integrated F-region conductivity, which is proportional to the neutral density that decreases with increasing height.

1.6. POYNTING FLUX

There is a way to estimate height-integrated Joule heating from spacecraft observations that circumvents problems in estimating ionospheric conductivities and the effects of plasma irregularities. Kelley et al. (1991) pointed out how measurements of the electric and magnetic fields above the ionosphere can be used to determine the downward component of the Poynting vector, or Poynting flux, and to estimate the height-integrated energy dissipation in the ionosphere/thermosphere by application of Poynting’s theorem (Poynting, 1884). As discussed by Kelley et al. (1991), Thayer and Semeter (2004), and others, it is useful for many ionospheric purposes to use the vector perturbation Poynting vector (equation (1.5)):

$$\mathbf{S}_p = \mathbf{E} \times \delta \mathbf{B} / \mu_0 \quad (1.5)$$

where $\delta \mathbf{B}$ is the vector perturbation of the geomagnetic field with respect to the main field $\mathbf{B}_0$, and μ_0 is the permeability of free space. If the electric field is electrostatic, the horizontally integrated perturbation Poynting flux over the top of the ionosphere essentially equals the vol-

ume-integrated electromagnetic energy dissipation within the ionosphere. Energy transfer associated with nonelectrostatic electric fields, such as ULF waves, is usually much smaller than that associated with quasi-static fields (Hartinger et al., 2015). Models of ionosphere-thermosphere dynamics show that the horizontally integrated energy flux is close to the total Joule heating (e.g., Lu et al., 1995; Matsuo & Richmond, 2008), with a minor contribution going to net generation of total kinetic energy of the wind, even though locally the transfer of electromagnetic energy to or from the wind ($\mathbf{V}_n \cdot \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}$) can be large (e.g., Thayer, 1998; Hurd & Larsen, 2016).

Under idealized conditions where $\mathbf{E}$ is orthogonal to the component of $\delta\mathbf{B}$ transverse to $\mathbf{B}_0$ and the two are proportional to each other over the top of the ionosphere, a point measurement of perturbation Poynting flux above the ionosphere gives the height-integrated rate of electromagnetic energy dissipation in the column below (Kelley et al., 1991; Waters et al., 2004; Huang & Burke, 2004; Weimer, 2005; Richmond, 2010). In more general cases, Richmond (2010) showed that the integrated Poynting flux over an area above the ionosphere bounded by an equipotential equals the electromagnetic energy dissipation rate in the volume below bounded by that equipotential on the sides and by the base of the ionosphere at the bottom, calling this the Equipotential-Boundary Poynting-Flux (EBPF) theorem. The EBPF theorem can be applied separately to different components of the electric potential, such as the large- and small-scale components. Since contours of the small-scale component of potential above the ionosphere tend to close over relatively localized regions, the associated small-scale structures of perturbation Poynting flux tend to be dissipated locally along geomagnetic-field lines below. However, for large-scale structures of perturbation Poynting flux, the local Poynting flux does not necessarily equal the height-integrated energy dissipation below, as also shown by Vanhamäki et al. (2012). In practice, this means that Poynting-flux measurements over regions of low ionospheric conductivity may differ significantly from the local rate of height-integrated energy dissipation, and that measurements of upward Poynting flux (e.g., Kelley et al., 1991; Gary et al., 1994, 1995) may not necessarily coincide with regions where the ionospheric wind dynamo is a net generator of electromagnetic energy.

1.7. OBSERVATIONS AND MODELING OF JOULE HEATING AND POYNTING FLUX

Joule heating can be calculated from equations (1.1) or (1.3) if all the parameters are known through adequate measurements or models. On the other hand, Poynting flux provides energy input estimates only in a height-

integrated sense, and so certain assumptions have to be made to be able to use Poynting flux in models of upper-atmosphere response (Deng et al., 2009). The heating rate can also be estimated from measurements of the ion and electron temperatures (e.g., St. Maurice & Hanson, 1982; St. Maurice et al., 1999). Measurements are available only at very limited locations and times, and so for applications requiring global knowledge of the heating, information from empirical models is generally required. Incoherent-scatter radars have provided detailed information about the vertical and temporal structure of overhead Joule heating (e.g., Wickwar et al., 1974; Banks, 1977; Vickrey et al., 1982; Thayer, 1998, 2000; Fujii et al., 1999; Aikio & Selkälä, 2009; Cai et al., 2013).

Cosgrove et al. (2014) constructed an empirical model of Poynting flux over the polar region as a function of magnetic latitude, MLT, dipole tilt angle, the IMF B_y and B_z components, and the AL index, using an extensive database from the FAST spacecraft. As explained earlier, the Poynting flux usually gives a good indication of height-integrated Joule heating, although it does not precisely locate the energy input. Figure 1.1 shows the distributions of Poynting flux and energy flux of precipitating auroral electrons averaged for all conditions (season, IMF strength, and direction). The largest Poynting fluxes encompass the polar cap, with a maximum in the afternoon and minima around 10 MLT and 23 MLT. There are secondary maxima around 3 MLT at 70° magnetic latitude and shortly after 12 MLT at 78° magnetic latitude, in the so-called cusp region. Strong Poynting flux or Joule heating in the cusp region has also been shown in other studies (Foster et al., 1983; Rich et al., 1991; Gary et al., 1995; Olsson et al., 2004; McHarg et al., 2005; Knipp et al., 2011; Wilder et al., 2012; Lu et al., 2018), while Cai et al. (2016) found there is often a “hot spot” at 75° magnetic latitude around 14–15 MLT. The cusp maximum appears most strongly when the IMF has a northward component, and is the dominant feature when the IMF clock angle is close to 0° . Figure 1.2 shows how the integral of the Poynting flux over the polar region varies with IMF clock angle and magnitude, dipole tilt angle (positive values representing summer conditions), and the magnitude of the AL index.

1.8. ESTIMATING JOULE HEATING THROUGH DATA ASSIMILATION

Empirical models are very useful for understanding how Joule heating varies with location, time, and season, and how it depends on external variations in solar and magnetic activity and conditions in the solar wind. Such models are often sufficient to characterize magnetospheric energy inputs to the upper atmosphere for




Figure 1.1 (Left) Average of the 30 sample distributions, covering all seasons and geophysical conditions, used for constructing the Poynting flux model. The hemispherically integrated flux is 74 GW. (Right) Average of the 30 sample distributions, covering all seasons and geophysical conditions, used for constructing the kinetic energy flux model. The hemispherically integrated flux is 12 GW. Note the different color scales on the left and right. *Source:* Cosgrove et al. (2014), adapted from (left) Figure 2, p. 418, and (right) Figure 14, p. 427. Reproduced with permission of the American Geophysical Union.

climatological studies of the upper atmosphere and for general responses to events like geomagnetic storms. However, because observations show that the energy inputs are highly variable in time and space, especially during storms but also during nonstorm conditions in regions like the dayside cusp, modeling thermospheric responses to Joule heating more accurately requires more detailed information about the energy inputs in time and space for such events. An approach to determining the space-time variations of magnetospheric energy inputs for individual events is through data assimilation. A simple form of data assimilation is to use a distribution of observations related to high-latitude electric fields and currents to produce a map of those fields and currents over the polar regions. Kamide et al. (1981) did this using ground magnetometer data to produce a map of ionospheric equivalent current, then to solve for an electric potential that drives the equivalent current using an ionospheric conductance model. Richmond and Kamide (1988) and Richmond et al. (1988) advanced the mapping of ionospheric electrodynamics by applying data-assimilation tools to combine ground-magnetometer data with climatological models of conductance and electric potential as well as radar observations of ionospheric drifts in order to constrain the estimated maps of electrodynamics in an optimal manner, given certain assumptions about conductances, thermospheric winds, and current geometry. The procedure was later named Assimilative Mapping of Ionospheric Electrodynamics (AMIE) (Richmond,

1992). It provides estimates of the large-scale electric fields, conductivities, and currents, as well as estimates of the uncertainty in these estimates. A quantitative estimate of the electric-field uncertainty can be used to correct estimates of Joule heating owing to underestimation of the squared electric-field strength (Richmond et al., 1990; Lu et al., 1998). AMIE has been extensively used to estimate energy and momentum inputs to the upper atmosphere during disturbed periods (e.g., Lu et al., 1995, 1998, 2014, 2016; Emery et al., 1996; Wilder et al., 2012). Matsuo et al. (2005) showed how the AMIE procedure could be improved by dynamic fitting of covariance matrix functions to the data. Assimilative mapping procedures for SuperDARN data have been developed by Ruohoniemi and Baker (1998), Shepherd and Ruohoniemi (2000), Cousins et al. (2013), and Gjerloev et al. (2018), while Waters et al. (2001), Anderson et al. (2014), Cousins et al. (2015), and Matsuo et al. (2015) developed procedures for mapping electrodynamic patterns using multisatellite magnetometer measurements of magnetic perturbations above the ionosphere.

The data-assimilation procedures for high-latitude electrodynamics developed so far have made simplifying assumptions about the conductivities and winds, with the winds generally neglected altogether. This limitation, as well as the inherent errors in the estimated fields, give rise to substantial uncertainty in the Joule heating and the thermosphere/ionosphere responses (e.g., Pedatella et al., 2018). More accurate data assimilation could potentially




Figure 1.2 Plots of the integrated Poynting flux as a function of various parameters: (a) The dependence on the IMF clock angle; (b) the dependence on the magnetic dipole tilt angle; (c) the dependence on the IMF magnitude in the GSM y - z plane; (d) the dependence on the AL index. Note the apparent saturation of the Poynting flux for large (negative) AL index, which behavior is probably nonphysical. When not otherwise indicated, the magnetic dipole tilt angle is 0° , the solar wind velocity is 450 km/s , the solar wind number density is 4 cm^{-3} , and the IMF strength in the GSM y - z plane is 5 nT . Source: Cosgrove et al. (2014), Figure 6, p. 422. Reproduced with permission of the American Geophysical Union.

be achieved by directly assimilating the various observations into a dynamic model of the thermosphere and ionosphere, taking into account the effects of electric fields on electric conductivities and neutral winds.

1.9. DYNAMICAL EFFECTS OF JOULE HEATING

Rapid variations of the heating produce thermospheric gravity waves in the lower thermosphere that propagate globally into the upper thermosphere, causing large oscillations of wind, temperature, composition, and density as well as large-scale traveling ionospheric disturbances (e.g., Wright, 1960; Chimonas & Hines, 1970; Testud, 1970; Yeh

& Liu, 1974; Richmond & Matsushita, 1975; Mayr et al., 1990; Fuller-Rowell et al., 1999; Forbes et al., 2005; Bruinsma et al., 2006; Bruinsma & Forbes, 2010; Lu et al., 2016). Figure 1.3 shows height-time variations of a number of thermosphere/ionosphere quantities as observed and simulated above the locations of the Millstone Hill (42.6°N and 288.5°E) and Arecibo (18.3°N and 293.3°E) radars for a magnetic storm on 10 September 2005 (Lu et al., 2008). A pulse of equatorward wind arrives at Millstone Hill starting around 16.7 UT and at Arecibo starting around 17.8 UT. The wind pulse maximizes at later times with descending altitude. It causes the ionosphere to rise temporarily, and then fall, as the gravity wave passes.




Figure 1.3 UT versus altitude profiles of row (a) and (a') measured electron density; row (b) and (b') simulated electron density; row (c) and (c') measured vertical ion drift; row (d) and (d') simulated vertical ion drift; row (e) and (e') simulated vertical ion drift due to neutral wind; and row (f) and (f') the simulated vertical ion drift component due to electric field. The solid white lines show the row (a) and (a') observed and row (b) and (b') simulated $h_m F_2$ on the storm day of 10 September, and the dashed white lines indicate the corresponding $h_m F_2$ on the quiet day of 8 September. The vertical dashed lines mark the onset of upward lift of electron density peak height over (left column) Millstone Hill and (right column) Arecibo. *Source:* Lu et al. (2008), Figure 2, p. A08304(3). Reproduced with permission of the American Geophysical Union.

Joule heating of a thermospheric gas parcel causes it to expand and to be more buoyant than its surroundings, which induces it to rise. Vertical winds are produced, which couple with horizontal outflow at higher altitudes, inflow at lower altitudes, and subsidence at other latitudes. On a global scale, circulation changes propagate at speeds up to the limiting horizontal speed of gravity waves, nearly the speed of sound. Thus, within several hours, the entire Earth responds to changes of Joule heating at high latitudes (e.g., Volland & Mayr, 1971; Mayr & Volland, 1973; Richmond, 1979; Fuller-Rowell et al., 1994, 1997; Sutton et al., 2009). The outflow and inflow can lie several scale heights apart in the vertical. Because the outflow and inflow mass fluxes must balance, the outflow in the low-density region has a much larger velocity than the inflow in the high-density region.

As a heated air parcel rises, it expands and cools adiabatically. In fact, there is a tendency for the parcel to move upward at such a rate that its density remains similar to that of its surroundings, thereby tending to eliminate horizontal variations of pressure and pressure scale height (Hays et al., 1973). Only relatively small horizontal pressure gradients are needed to drive the divergent horizontal winds that balance the mass convergence associated with the upward wind. However, horizontal gradients of the scale height are not completely eliminated, for at least three reasons. First, transience in the dynamics, especially due to gravity waves, is inherently associated with pressure gradients. Second, even in a steady state, residual horizontal pressure gradients are needed to balance other forces like the Coriolis and centrifugal forces and the forces due to ion drag and viscosity (Schoendorf et al., 1996; Fuller-Rowell et al., 1999; Lu et al., 2016). In most cases these forces have little direct relation to Joule heating, and so the horizontal pressure variations and related temperature and density variations can have patterns very different from those of Joule heating (Mayr & Harris, 1978; Trinks et al., 1978; Schoendorf et al., 1996; Lu et al., 2016). Third, rapid heat conduction and vertical diffusion in the upper thermosphere tend to keep the upper thermosphere close to a state of isothermal diffusive equilibrium, in which the density variation with height would be entirely determined by the temperature and composition at the lowest altitude where isothermal diffusive equilibrium is effective. The pressure scale height is proportional to T/m , where T is temperature and m is the mean molecular mass. For a state of isothermal diffusive equilibrium, T would be constant in height but m would decrease with increasing height at a rate dependent on the O/N_2 ratio. Even if the pressure scale height at 400 km were horizontally uniform but T and m each varied horizontally, T/m would not be horizontally uniform at other heights. The study by Thayer et al. (2012) explains how the scale

heights of pressure and density differ, depending on different thermospheric compositions.

1.10. JOULE HEATING EFFECTS ON COMPOSITION, TEMPERATURE, AND DENSITY

Since the O/N_2 ratio in the thermosphere increases with altitude, an air parcel rising from lower to higher altitudes has a smaller O/N_2 ratio than its surroundings, which means its mean molecular mass is greater than that of its surroundings. In the upper thermosphere, regions of enhanced N_2 density are indicative of strong heating below (Taeusch et al., 1971; Taeusch & Hinton, 1975). If the circulation were able to completely eliminate horizontal variations of T/m , regions of enhanced m produced by upwelling would coincide with regions of proportionately enhanced temperature. As shown by Mayr and Volland (1973), the high-latitude decrease of O/N_2 , which increases m , allows the temperature to increase considerably above the temperature in neighboring regions with smaller O/N_2 density. Other observations and model studies also indicate that T and m in the upper thermosphere tend to be spatially correlated over the Earth during disturbances (e.g., Qian et al., 2010; Lu et al., 2016).

Most of the Joule heating occurs in the lower thermosphere, where Pedersen conductivity is greatest when there is ionization by sunlight or auroral particle precipitation. Only 18%–34% of the Joule heating occurs above 150 km (Deng et al., 2011a; Huang et al., 2012b). However, owing to the smaller mass density at high altitudes, this relatively small high-altitude fraction of the heating has a disproportionate impact on the upper thermosphere and F region ionosphere (Deng et al., 2011a; Huang et al., 2012b; Brinkman et al., 2016). The immediate temperature response to a change in heating per unit volume is inversely proportional to the mass density, which is roughly a thousand times smaller at 400 km than at 125 km. However, temperature perturbations at high altitude are smoothed by rapid heat conduction, which is also inversely proportional to air density, so that after 6 h most of the heat deposited anywhere above 150 km has spread out over all altitudes above 150 km, with some of the heat conducted down below 150 km. The thermospheric density at 400 km responds to changes in scale height at all lower altitudes, so on a global scale, Joule heat deposited anywhere above 150 km affects the 400 km density comparably after about 6 h. On the other hand, heat deposited below 150 km has a much smaller effect on the density at 400 km within 6 h, apart from the possible generation of acoustic-gravity waves (Deng et al., 2011a). However, the low-altitude heat plays an important role in high-altitude density changes on longer timescales. Huang et al. (2012b) analyzed the effects of heating at different heights on the global 400 km density response.

An example of a model simulation of the complex relation between upper-thermosphere density and Joule heating is illustrated in Figure 1.4. This shows sequences of neutral mass density at 380 km altitude (top) and height-integrated Joule heating (bottom) over the southern polar region (-40° to -90° geographic latitude) for the geomagnetic storm of 17 January 2005 with observed mass densities from the CHAMP satellite overlain. There are density increases over Antarctica at 12:20 UT and 13:30 UT that have some correspondence with the distributions of Joule heating at those times, though many details differ. At 13:50 UT, the spatial correspondence between density and height-integrated Joule heating has disappeared entirely, owing to the relaxation of the polar density bulge and the equatorward propagation of a large-scale gravity wave.

It is clear that Joule heating has a major impact on the thermosphere during magnetic storms. Even at quiet times, high-latitude Joule heating affects thermospheric temperature, composition, and density not only locally, but also to some extent globally (Reber & Hedin, 1974; Dickinson et al., 1975, 1977; Roble et al., 1977). Knipp et al. (2004) estimated that daily-average Joule heating, integrated over the globe, ranged from 7 GW to 2,035 GW during the years 1975–2003, with an average value of 95 GW. This amounts to 16% of the average total energy input to the thermosphere, 595 GW, from combined solar

extreme- and far-ultraviolet radiation, Joule heating, and auroral particle precipitation. When we take into account that less than half of the solar radiation and auroral particle energy absorbed in the thermosphere leads to direct heating (the remainder going to the breaking of O_2 chemical bonds and to airglow), the relative importance of Joule heating to overall thermospheric heating is seen to be quite important. During large magnetic storms, Joule heating can totally dominate thermospheric heat input.

Joule heating also affects thermospheric temperature indirectly, through its role in modulating the production of radiatively active NO. Because the reaction rate of ground-state N with O_2 to form NO is highly dependent on temperature (Siskind et al., 1989); more NO is produced when the temperature is elevated. The increased NO density, in turn, increases the radiative cooling rate of the thermosphere (Barth et al., 2009).

Studies of how the thermosphere responds to recurrent geomagnetic activity have helped quantify the role of Joule heating (e.g., Mlynarczyk et al., 2008; Deng et al., 2011b; Huang et al., 2012a; Jiang et al., 2014). For example, Jiang et al. (2014) showed that the standard parameterization of high-latitude electric potential and particle precipitation used in the Thermosphere-Ionosphere-Mesosphere General Circulation Model (TIME-GCM) based on the K_p index underestimates the amount of Joule heating needed




Figure 1.4 Maps of (top row) neutral mass density at 380 km and (bottom row) height-integrated Joule heating over the southern hemisphere. The small colored dots indicate the CHAMP trajectory, with the color of each dot corresponding to the mass density value measured by CHAMP using the color scale from the top row. The outer circle corresponds to $40^\circ S$, and the triangle in each map indicates the magnetic south pole. Source: G. Lu et al., 2016, Figure 4, p. 7115. Reproduced with permission of the American Geophysical Union.

- CO₂ data, 328–29
- Kelvin waves observations, 195
- PMC observations, 330–31, *See also*
 - Polar mesosphere clouds
- Q2DW observations, 204f, 205, 206f, *See also* Quasi 2 day wave
- temperature measurements, 330, 411
- traveling forced planetary waves, 193
- South Atlantic Anomaly (SAA), 122f, 123
- Space access, 512–13
- Space Shuttle, 512
- Space weather, 159, 469
 - forecasting, 489
- SpaceX, 512
- Spatial distortion, 492
- Special Sensor Ultraviolet
 - Spectrographic Imager (SSUSI), 492, 492f, 496, 502, 507, 508f, 509, 511f, 512f
 - NO emission observations, 503, *See also* Nitric oxide
- Special Sensor Ultraviolet
 - Spectrographic Limb Imager (SSULI), 496
- Spectral Mesosphere/Lower Thermosphere Model (SMLTM), 409
- Spectral radiances, 453, 457, 474–77, 475f
- Spectral splits, 453
- Spectrometers, 469
 - ASIC, 479, *See also* All-sky airglow imager
 - FPGA, 461, *See also* Field Programmable Gate Array
 - MEM, 461, 461f, *See also* Microwave Electrojet Magnetogram
- Spectropolarimeter, 462, 462f
- Spectroscopy, 494
- SPIDR database, 328
- Spoon effect, 203
- Sporadic E layer mechanism, 431
- Sporadic metal layers, 429–32
- SPWs. *See* Stationary planetary waves (SPWs)
- Sq. *See* Solar quiet
- SSULI. *See* Special Sensor Ultraviolet Spectrographic Limb Imager
- SSUSI. *See* Special Sensor Ultraviolet Spectrographic Imager
- SSUSI-Lite, 510
- SSW. *See* Stratospheric sudden warming
- Standard deviation, 328
- Starfire Optical Range (SOR), 417, 420–23
- Starlink, 512
 - Stationary planetary waves (SPWs), 161, 161f, 175, 193, *See also* Planetary waves
 - PW momentum deposition, 197
 - solar semidiurnal tide, 164–66
 - tide modulation, 164
- Stewart, Balfour, 162
- STM. *See* Science traceability matrix
- Stokes approach, 459–63, 463f, 464, 474
- Storm-enhanced density (SED), 239, 240, 243–44, 244f, 247, 516
- Storm-time ion drag, 42, 56
- Storm-time ionosphere, 516
- Storm-time O/N₂ depletion, 115
- Storm-time penetration electron fields, 244
- Storm-time plasmasphere, 244, 244f
- Storm-time solar wind-magnetosphere interaction, 239
- St. Patrick's Day storm of 2015, 71, 73
- Stratospheric sudden warming (SSW), 93–94, 159, 164f, 174, 284–85, 291, 435–36
 - A-I coupling by atmospheric tides, 163–69, 165f, *See also* Atmosphere-Ionosphere coupling
 - lidar, 414–15
 - PWs, 197, *See also* Planetary waves
 - semidiurnal lunar tide, 286
 - solar tides, 287
 - thermosphere, 290
 - upward-propagating tides, 288
 - WAM simulations, 167
- Student Nitric Oxide Explorer (SNOE), 188
- Subauroral ion drifts (SAIDs), 241
- Subauroral large-scale structures, 240–43
- Subauroral Polarization Streams (SAPS), 65, 70, 71–73, 240–43
- Sudden increases in TEC (SITEC), 314
- Sunspot number, 303, 304
- Sunspot regions, 269
- SuperDARN data, 8
 - SAPS observations, 241, *See also* Subauroral Polarization Streams
- Superrotation, 87–88
- SW. *See* Secondary waves
- SW1 tide, 82, 82f, 165, 165f, 168
- SW2 tide, 82–83, 82f, 93, 165, 165f, 168. *See also* Solar migrating tide
- SW3 tide, 165f, 168, 220
- SW6 tide, 218
- Swarm, 254
 - magnetometers, 452
 - mass density, 269
 - planetary wave observations, 94
- SXR. *See* Soft X-rays
- SZA. *See* Solar zenith angle
- TAD. *See* Traveling atmospheric disturbances
- TEC. *See* Total electron content
- Temperature
 - hydrostatic equilibrium, 136
 - Joule heating, 11
 - long-term trends, 329–31, 330f, 336
 - mesopause, 403, 405–6
 - metal fluorescence lidar measurement, 397–400
 - WACCM, 122f, 123, *See also* Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model
- Temperature Compensated Crystal Oscillator (TCXO), 478
- Temperature inversion layers, 426
- Terdiurnal tides, 167, 221
- TGCM. *See* Thermosphere General Circulation Model
- Thermal escape flux, 138–39
- Thermosphere
 - composition
 - geomagnetic storm, 505f
 - PW transport and mixing effect, 203–6, *See also* Planetary waves
 - solar activity, 308
 - vertical structure, 109
 - dynamics, 470
 - FPI observations, 387–90
 - FUV observations, 129, 130, *See also* Far ultraviolet
 - emissions, 116
 - O/N₂ column density ratio, 116–20
 - gradient of composition, 55
 - gravity waves, 4
 - Joule heating
 - composition, temperature, and density effects, 11–13, 12f
 - dynamical effects, 9, 10f, 11
 - limb sounding of wind profiles, 470–77
 - lower atmospheric wave coupling, 52–54
 - lower thermosphere
 - composition changes, 197
 - effective temperature, 120–25
 - lidar measurements, 396–402
 - PWs, 197, 199–200, *See also* Planetary waves
 - major constituents, 496–97
 - meteorological forcing, 288, 290
 - N 149.3 nm emission, 127–29, 128f
 - neutral density data, 255
 - neutral winds, 79
 - NO variations, 125–27, *See also* Nitric oxide
 - PW impacts, 197–207, *See also* Planetary waves
 - secondary waves, 207
 - solar flare responses, 255–60, 314–19
 - solar rotation responses, 277–78
 - SSWs, 290, *See also* Stratospheric sudden warming

- lower thermosphere (*cont'd*)
 tidal wave characterization, 412
 upper thermosphere
 momentum forcing, 42–45
 pressure gradient, 42–43
 wind variations, 45–52
 vertical structure, 108f
 composition, 109
 wind dynamics, 19, 85–86
 wind observations, 58–59
- Thermosphere General Circulation
 Model (TGCM), 66, 73
- Thermosphere-Ionosphere-Electrodynamics General Circulation Model (TIE-GCM), 20, 35, 84, 87, 345, 347, 492
- ETA, 231, *See also* Equatorial thermosphere anomaly
- ion drag force, 43–44, 44f
- mass density, 224
- neutral wind simulations, 21, 21f, 24, 25f, 34
- OSE, 350–53, 358, *See also* Observing System Experiments
- OSSE, 354, 358, *See also* Observing System Simulation Experiment
- PV time derivative, 30, 31f, 32f, *See also* Potential vorticity
- SAPS, 242, *See also* Subauroral Polarization Streams
- SED, 244, *See also* Storm-enhanced density
- thermospheric oscillations, 387
- vertical vorticity, 26
- Thermosphere-Ionosphere-Mesosphere-Electrodynamics General Circulation Model (TIME-GCM), 12, 46f, 169, 175, 203, 411, 470
- EIA, 234, 235, *See also* Equatorial ionization anomaly
- ELP, 266, *See also* EUV late phase
- ETA, 231, 234, 235, *See also* Equatorial thermosphere anomaly
- ExB drift, 260, 260f
- flare response, 255, 256f, 258–59, 258f, 259f
- Kelvin waves, 195, 196f
- meridional acceleration terms, 46f, 47f
- MERRA-forced, 170–71
- MTM coupling, 54
- PW momentum deposition, 197, *See also* Planetary waves
- Q2DW, 192, *See also* Quasi 2 day wave
- seasonal variations, 48–50
- solar cycle variations, 50, 50f–52f
- solar flares, 254
- SSW, 170, *See also* Stratospheric sudden warming
- TADS, 269, *See also* Traveling atmospheric disturbances
- zonal winds, 48, 48f
- Thermosphere Ionosphere Mesosphere Energetics and Dynamics (TIMED), 86, 116, 117, 151, 163, 183, 208, 376, 411, 473, 502
- SEE, 255, 302, *See also* Solar Extreme Ultraviolet Experiment
- free Rossby waves, 188
- Kelvin waves observations, 195
- mass density observations, 223
- N-149.3 radiances, 128
- O/N₂ observations, 497, *See also* O to N₂ column density ratio
- PW, 193, *See also* Planetary waves
- Q2DW hemispheric differences, 191, *See also* Quasi 2 day wave
- Thermospheric column O/N₂ response, 502, 503f
- Thermospheric gap, 129
- Thermospheric metal layers, 429–30, 432–34
- Thermospheric spoon, 110
- Thermospheric wind sensing, 470
- Thunderstorms, 367
- concentric gravity waves, 373, 375–77
- current, 81
- Thz heterodyne technology, 477–84, 477f
- THz Limb Sounder (TLS), 469, 479
- instrument, 481–83, 481f, 482f, 482t, 483t
- Thz mixer, 479–81
- THz Schottky diode, 478
- Tibetan Plateau, 367, 368
- gravity waves, 370, 371f, 372
- TID. *See* Traveling ionosphere disturbances
- Tidal forcing, 410
- Tidal ion layer (TIL), 433
- Tidal waves, 410
- day-to-day variability, 412
- lidar observations, 411–14
- seasonal variations, 412–13, 413f
- Tidal wind forcing, 87
- Tidal winds, 160
- Tide-driven meridional circulation, 168
- Tide-ionosphere coupling, 160–62, 161f
- Tides, 52, 54, 82, 159, 184, 490
- A-I coupling, 169–74, 171f, *See also* Atmosphere-Ionosphere coupling
- dissipating, 160, 168
- ETA and EIA modulation, 233–34, *See also* Equatorial thermosphere anomaly, Equatorial ionization anomaly
- gravity wave interactions, 436
- lidar measurement, 410–14
- migrating, 217, 218
- nonmigrating, 85, 162, 217, 218, 220–23
- PWs modulating, 164, 172, 173, *See also* Planetary waves
- Q2DW, 194, 203, *See also* Quasi 2 day wave
- upward-propagating, 288
- vertically propagating, 168
- wind shear, 424
- TIDI. *See* TIMED Doppler Interferometer
- TIE-GCM. *See* Thermosphere-Ionosphere-Electrodynamics General Circulation Model
- TIL. *See* Tidal ion layer
- TIMED. *See* Thermosphere Ionosphere Mesosphere Energetics and Dynamics
- TIMED Doppler Interferometer (TIDI), 86, 92, 199, 206, 207f, 473
- Time Dependent Ionosphere Model, 244
- TIME-GCM. *See* Thermosphere-Ionosphere-Mesosphere-Electrodynamics General Circulation Model
- Time-Resolved Observations of Precipitation structure and storm Intensity with a Constellation of SmallSats (TROPICS), 460
- T-I system. *See* Ionosphere-thermosphere system
- TLS. *See* THz Limb Sounder
- TMA. *See* Trimethyl aluminum
- TOI. *See* Tongue of Ionization
- TOMEX. *See* Turbulent Oxygen Mixing Experiment
- Tongue of Ionization (TOI), 239, 240, 244–47
- Total electron content (TEC), 74, 76, 116, 119, 120, 120f, 130f, 243, 244, 305, 511f
- data assimilation, 499, 501f
- day-to-day variations, 283, 284f, 285
- EUV, 306, 313, 314, *See also* Extreme ultraviolet radiation
- GPS data, 254, 255, 498
- Q2DW response, 201, 204f, *See also* Quasi 2 day wave
- semidiurnal lunar tide, 286
- solar activity, 516
- solar flares, 254, 257, 257f, 318
- trends, 329, 336, 337
- UV images, 504f
- Transfer functions, 490
- Transient solar events, 276–77
- Traveling atmospheric disturbances (TAD), 86, 115, 116, 121, 123, 129, 130, 254, 278

- solar flares and geomagnetic storms, 268–69
- Traveling ionosphere disturbances (TID), 115, 116, 123, 130, 130f, 269, 489, 489t
- medium-scale, 368, 390
- Traveling planetary waves, 161, 161f
- Tree rings, 303, 312
- Trimethyl aluminum (TMA), 429
- TROPICS. *See* Time-Resolved Observations of Precipitation structure and storm Intensity with a Constellation of SmallSats
- Tropopause
 - greenhouse, 336
 - polar jet, 420
 - water levels, 107, 109, 138
- Turbopause, 107–8
 - hydrogen, 140
- Turbulence
 - atmospheric mixing, 107–8, 136, 137
 - gravity wave breaking, 424
 - lidar, 424–25,
- Turbulent Oxygen Mixing Experiment (TOMEX), 428–29
- TWINS. *See* Two Wide-angle Imaging Neutral-atom Spectrometers
- Two-Stokes solution, 461
- Two Wide-angle Imaging Neutral-atom Spectrometers (TWINS), 151
- TXCO. *See* Temperature Compensated Crystal Oscillator
- Typhoons, 367, 386f
- UARS. *See* Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite
- UFKWs. *See* Ultra-fast Kelvin waves
- ULF waves, 7
- Ultra-fast Kelvin waves (UFKW), 161f, 162, 175, 195, 196f, 203, 208
 - A-I coupling, 169–74, *See also* Atmosphere-Ionosphere coupling
 - day-to-day variability, 288
- Ultraviolet radiation (UV), 217, 494, *See also* Far ultraviolet
 - heating, 3, 12
 - solar cycle variation, 137
- Ultraviolet remote sensing, 498–509, 504f
 - auroral imaging, 503–7
 - ionospheric imaging, 507–9
- Ultraviolet Visible Imaging and Spectrographic Imaging (UVISI), 509f
- University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, 347
- Upper atmosphere
 - greenhouse cooling, 326
 - hydrogen, 110–11
 - oxygen, 109
 - Upper atmosphere heating, eclipses, 51–52
 - Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite (UARS), 21, 165–66, 166f, 183, 255, 331, 473, 481
 - free Rossby waves, 187, 188
 - Upper thermosphere
 - pressure gradient, 42–43
 - viscous drag, 45
 - wind variations, *See also* Wind
 - longitude, 45–48
 - season and hemisphere, 48–50
 - solar cycle, 50–52
 - Upper thermospheric winds, 41, *See also* Wind
 - Upward-propagating tides, 288
 - Upward-propagating waves, 291–92
 - URSI World Day campaign, 203
 - UVISI. *See* Ultraviolet Visible Imaging and Spectrographic Imaging
 - Vector Field Magnetometer, 452
 - Vegard-Kaplan bands (VK bands), 116
 - Vertical advection, 54–55, 55f
 - Vertical drift, 79, 82, 82f, 172f
 - ionosphere, 91–92
 - solar activity, 309
 - Vertical heat flux, 422
 - Vertical ion drift, 10f
 - Vertically propagating acoustic wave, 73
 - Vertically propagating tides, 168
 - Vertical structure equation (VSE), 185
 - Vertical TEC (VTEC), 501f, *See also* Total electron content
 - Vertical vorticity, 19
 - high-latitude lower thermospheric winds, 24–28
 - horizontal advection, 37
 - Vertical winds, 3, 11, 55, 110
 - adiabatic heating and cooling, 56
 - Joule heating, 67
 - nonhydrostatic processes, 67–73
 - upper thermosphere composition, 110
 - V/H feedhorn. *See* Dual-linearly polarized feedhorn
 - Vibrational Raman channel, 397
 - Viscous drag force, 45
 - VK bands. *See* Vegard-Kaplan bands
 - VSE. *See* Vertical structure equation
 - VTEC. *See* Vertical TEC
 - WACCM. *See* Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model
 - WACCM-X. *See* Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model–Extended
 - WAM. *See* Whole Atmosphere Model
 - Wavenumber broadening, 173–74
 - Wave-wave interaction, 162
 - Weakly ionized plasma region, 79
 - WHAM. *See* Wisconsin H α Mapper
 - Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model (WACCM), 84, 209, 328
 - gravity waves, 424
 - PWs, 193, *See also* Planetary waves
 - Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model–Extended (WACCM-X), 330, 492
 - Whole Atmosphere Model (WAM), 94
 - SSW simulations, 167, *See also* Stratospheric sudden warming
 - Whole atmosphere models. *See also specific models*
 - nonhydrostatic GCM formulations, 67
 - SSW, 168, *See also* Stratospheric sudden warming
 - Williams, Biff, 402
 - Wind
 - ExB drift, 173
 - Joule heating, 5
 - long-term trends, 331–32
 - metal fluorescence lidar measurement, 397–400
 - thermospheric dynamics, 19, 85–86
 - tides, 160
 - upper thermosphere composition, 110
 - upper thermosphere variations, 45–52
 - Wind dynamo, 79, 83–84
 - conductivities, 84–85
 - evening, 86–87
 - FUV, 90, *See also* Far ultraviolet
 - ionospheric disturbance dynamo, 94–95
 - lunar and solar semidiurnal tidal contributions, 93–94
 - nighttime, 87–89
 - planetary wave contributions, 94
 - tidal and wave signatures, 89–93
 - Wind Imaging Interferometer (WINDII), 21, 21f, 86, 199
 - Wind shear, 424
 - Wisconsin H α Mapper (WHAM), 146–47, 149, 150, 153
 - World Wide Lightning Location Network (WWLLN), 375
 - WRF model, 67
 - WWLLN. *See* World Wide Lightning Location Network
 - Xinglong station, 368, 369
 - X-ray irradiance, 301
 - solar flares, 85, 276
 - X-ray Irradiance Sensors (XRS), 255, 264

- X-ray ultraviolet radiation (XUV), 263, 301
 - observations, 302
 - solar proxies, 302–4, *See also* F10.7 index
- XRS. *See* X-ray Irradiance Sensors
- XUV. *See* X-ray ultraviolet radiation
- Y-factor, 480
- Zeeman effect, 451, 452–53, 466, 474
- Zeeman magnetic-field sensing
 - technique, 451, 452–53
- O₂ 118-GHz emission line, 454–56, 454f, 455t
 - optimizing O₂ Zeeman technique, 457, 459–60
 - scalar B-field measurements, 456–57
- Zonal drift, 79
- F-region, 87
 - ionosphere, 92–93
- Zonal plasma drifts, 267–68
- Zonal winds, 47, 48f, 49, 92, 164f, 187
 - dissipating waves, 187
 - momentum equations, 42
- QTDW, 53, *See also* Quasi 2 day wave
- seasonal variations, 48
- solar activity, 50, 51