Multi-point measurements of the plasma properties inside an aurora from the SPIDER sounding rocket

Giono Gabriel¹, Ivchenko Nickolay², Sergienko Tima³, and Brändström Urban⁴

¹Royal Institute of Technology ²Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) ³Swedish Institute of Space Physics ⁴Institute of Space Physics

November 16, 2022

Abstract

The Small Payloads for Investigation of Disturbances in Electrojet by Rockets (SPIDER) sounding rocket was launched on February 2nd 2016 (21:09 UT), deploying ten free falling units (FFUs) inside a westward travelling auroral surge. Each FFUs deployed spherical electric field and Langmuir probes on wire-booms, providing in situ multi-point recordings of the electric field and plasma properties. The analytical retrieval of the plasma parameters, namely the electron density, electron temperature and plasma potential, from the Langmuir probe measurements was non-trivial due to sheath effects and detailed explanation are discussed in this article. An empirical assumption on the sheath thickness was required, which was confirmed by simulating the plasma environment around the FFU using the Spacecraft Plasma Interaction Software (SPIS). In addition, the retrieved electron density and temperature are also in agreement with the simultaneous incoherent scatter radar measurements from the EISCAT facility. These two independent confirmations provided a good level of confidence in the plasma parameters obtained from the FFUs, and events observed during the flight are discussed in more details. Hints of drift-wave instabilities and Hall current introduced by increased electron precipitation inside a region of enhanced density were observed by the FFUs.

Multi-point measurements of the plasma properties inside an aurora from the SPIDER sounding rocket.

G. Giono^{1,2}, N. Ivchenko¹, T. Sergienko³ and U. Brändström³

¹Department of Space and Plasma Physics, KTH-Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden ²Leibniz Institute of Atmospheric Physics at the Rostock University (IAP), Kühlungsborn, Germany ³IRF-Swedish Institute of Space Physics, Kiruna, Sweden

Key Points:

1

2

3

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

- Multi-point *in situ* measurement of plasma properties.
- Auroral study.
 - Sounding rocket instrumentation.
 - Sheath simulation.

Corresponding author: G. Giono, ggiono@kth.se

12 Abstract

The Small Payloads for Investigation of Disturbances in Electrojet by Rockets (SPIDER) sounding rocket was launched on February 2nd 2016 (21:09 UT), deploying ten free falling units (FFUs) inside a westward travelling auroral surge. Each FFUs deployed spherical electric field and Langmuir probes on wire-booms, providing *in situ* multi-point recordings of the electric field and plasma properties.

The analytical retrieval of the plasma parameters, namely the electron density, electron temper-18 ature and plasma potential, from the Langmuir probe measurements was non-trivial due to sheath 19 20 effects and detailed explanation are discussed in this article. An empirical assumption on the sheath thickness was required, which was confirmed by simulating the plasma environment around the FFU 21 using the Spacecraft Plasma Interaction Software (SPIS). In addition, the retrieved electron density 22 and temperature are also in agreement with the simultaneous incoherent scatter radar measurements 23 from the EISCAT facility. These two independent confirmations provided a good level of confi-24 dence in the plasma parameters obtained from the FFUs, and events observed during the flight are 25 discussed in more details. Hints of drift-wave instabilities and Hall current introduced by increased 26 electron precipitation inside a region of enhanced density were observed by the FFUs. 27

1 Introduction

Auroral electrojet are atmospheric optical emission seen at polar latitude. These phenomena are created by the precipitation of energetic particles from outer space (*e.g.* solar wind) being funnelled along Earth's magnetic field lines and ionizing the atomic elements present in the atmosphere by collision. Auroras typically occur in the E region, the lowest part of the ionosphere located at heights between 100 and 120 kilometers. This region holds still some important scientific questions, as the dynamic of the micro processes is not fully understood.

The Small Payloads for Investigation of Disturbances in Electrojet by Rockets (SPIDER) sound-35 ing rocket experiment was designed to investigate the various spatial and temporal scales of these 36 phenomena, in particular the Farley-Buneman instability which induces a relative drift motion be-37 tween ions and electrons and is expected to occur at altitudes between 85 and 95 km. Such insta-38 bility possibly leads to electrostatic waves, predicted by theory and MHD simulations [Oppenheim 39 and Dimant, 2013] but not yet observed experimentally. Multi-point measurements are achieved 40 by ejecting ten identical disc-shape free falling units (FFUs) from the rocket, each equipped with a 41 suite of instruments to characterize the plasma and electromagnetic properties of the aurora: four 42 spherical electric field probes deployed on 2 m booms recording the 2-dimensional projection of the 43 electric field in the spin-plane of the FFU, four spherical Langmuir probes on 1 m booms for the 44 plasma properties (i.e. density and temperature, plasma potential) and a fluxgate sensor for the mag-45 netic field. The SPIDER rocket was launched on February 2nd 2016 (21:09 UT) from the Esrange 46 space center in northern Sweden. 47

In this article, a detailed analysis of the Langmuir probe measurements from two out of the six 48 recovered FFU is presented. The instrument and measurements are first introduced in Section 2. An 49 overview of the analytical methodology used to retrieve the plasma parameters is given in Section 3, 50 with further details discussed in Appendix A. These results were compared to a hybrid plasma 51 simulation of the FFU and its Langmuir probe using the Spacecraft Plasma Interaction Software 52 (SPIS), shown in Appendix B. The retrieved parameters are also compared to the simultaneous 53 incoherent scatter radar measurements from EISCAT taken along the rocket path in Section 4. With 54 confidence in the FFU measurements, Section 5 discussed two particularly interesting events seen 55 during the flight. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the difficulties of interpreting Langmuir probe 56 measurements in intermediate sheath regime and discusses possible improvement for future flights. 57

2 Langmuir probe measurements

Langmuir probes can be used to estimate plasma properties such as its density and temperature by recording the current-voltage characteristic of the plasma, *i.e.* the *I-V* curve. This is achieved by fixing the probe potential (*i.e.* probe bias) with respect to the FFU hull and recording the current induced as the plasma responds to the probe potential. The *I-V* curve is recorded by performing measurements at various probe biases, which is also referred as sweeps.

Each SPIDER FFU carried four gold-coated spherical Langmuir probes (r = 12.5 mm) deployed on 1 meter long wire-boom. Two out of the four probes operated short sweeps between -0.5 V to +0.5 V, whereas a third probe was operating long sweeps from -3 V to +1.5 V. The remaining probe was set to a fixed voltage bias of -5 V, monitoring fluctuation of the ion current. The recording electronic was designed with an adjustable gain amplifier automatically scaling the current range: the finest resolution range was between -150 pA and +250 pA whereas the largest range available was between -150 nA and +250 nA.

However, the plasma condition encountered during the flight led to a larger than expected cur-71 rent being collected. In addition, an unexpectedly large payload charging of -0.8 V was observed. 72 This shifted the sweeps towards the ion branch, saturating all measurements from the short sweep 73 and fixed bias Langmuir probes. As a result, only a limited part of the long-sweep had unsaturated 74 75 measurements of the current. Short-circuits between the wire-booms and the hull induced by the wobble motion of the FFU also compromised the measurements from some FFUs. Figure 1 shows 76 the usable measurements from FFU02 and FFU06, for bias between -0.1 V to -0.7 V, respectively 77 sampling from the ion saturation current to the foot of the exponentially increasing electron current. 78 Some short-circuits can be seen in FFU02 between 145 and 155 s, as well as around 210 s. 79



Figure 1. Langmuir probe measurements for FFU02 (a) and FFU06 (b) from 145 s to 255 s after launch. Colors dots show the current measured by the probe for the various voltage biases with respect to the hull. The large variability of the measured current seen for FFU02 around 150 s is due to the wobble-induced shortcircuits between the boom and the hull.

3 Analytical retrieval of the plasma parameters

Given the proper analytic formulation of the ion saturation current and electron exponential electron current, one can retrieve the plasma parameters from the Langmuir probe current-voltage characteristic. Although the theory of current collection by a Langmuir probe is a well studied topic, both in the laboratory and onboard spacecrafts [*Mott-Smith and Langmuir*, 1926; *Sagalyn et al.*, 1963; *Fahleson et al.*, 1974; *Pedersen et al.*, 2008], its analytical treatment can quickly become

complicated due to sheath effects. The sheath is the region around the probe where the plasma quasi-90 neutrality breaks down due to the intrusive electric potential induced by the probe, and can affect the 91 ion collection. For simplicity of treatment, most of the analytical formulations are generally derived 92 in one of the two following regimes: thin-sheath or large-sheath (also known as orbital motion 93 limit regime), where the sheath thickness is either negligible or much larger than the probe radius, respectively. Following this reasoning, Langmuir probes are usually designed to operate in one of 95 these two regimes based on the expected plasma density and temperature to be probed. However, the 96 presented case does not fall into either of these two extreme regimes, but rather in an intermediate 97 regime where the sheath thickness is comparable to the probe radius. In addition, collection of ions 98 by the probe motion through the plasma also needs to be accounted for, as the FFUs were moving 99 at a velocity ranging from 200 m/s at apogee (*i.e.* lateral velocity) to more than 1000 m/s in the up 100 and down-legs. 101

The collected current I is formulated as the sum of both the electron current I_{electron} minus the ion current I_{ion} as

$$I = I_{\text{electron}} + I_{\text{ion}} \tag{1}$$

The electron current in the transition region is expressed as a exponential function of the electron temperature $T_{\rm e}$

$$I_{\text{electron}} = 4\pi r^2 n \text{e} \sqrt{\frac{\text{k}_{\text{B}} T_{\text{e}}}{2\pi m_{\text{e}}}} e^{\text{e}(V - V_p)/(\text{k}_{\text{B}} T_{\text{e}})}$$
(2)

where r is the radius of the spherical probe, k_B is the Boltzmann constant and m_e is the mass of the electron. The factor in front of the exponential corresponds to the current collected by the thermal motion of the electron, assuming a Maxwellian distribution.

Similarly, the ion saturation current is expressed as

$$I_{\rm ion} = -4\pi r^2 n e \sqrt{\frac{k_{\rm B} T_{\rm i}}{2\pi m_{\rm i}}} I_{\rm acc}$$
(3)

where the current collected by the random motion of the ions is multiplied by a factor which include 105 the effect of the probe potential (*i.e.* attracting more ions as the potential becomes more negative) 106 and the collection of ions as the probe moves through the plasma. This factor is denoted as $I_{\rm acc}$, as it 107 corresponds to the current induced by the ions accelerated towards the probe. In order to avoid shift-108 ing the focus on the analysis rather than on the results, the expression used for $I_{\rm acc}$ and the details 109 about the rest of the analytical retrieval are presented in Appendix A. In short, an empirical estima-110 tion of the sheath thickness around the probe was required due to the Langmuir probe operating in 111 an intermediate sheath regime (*i.e.* not thin nor large sheath regims). With this assumption, Equa-112 tion (1) was fitted on the measured current-voltage characteristics to obtain the plasma parameters 113 (electron density, electron temperature and plasma potential). In addition, hybrid plasma simula-114 tions using the Spacecraft Plasma Interaction Software [SPIS, Roussel et al., 2008] were used to 115 reproduce the sheath thickness and the current-voltage characteristic of the probe, providing further 116 confidence in the analytical retrieval. These simulations are presented in Appendix B. 117

Figure 2 shows the time-serie of the electron density, electron temperature and plasma potential 118 (with respect to the floating potential) along the flight of the two FFUs considered. For better display 119 purposes, the obviously unrealistic values due to short-circuits were removed and the time-series 120 were smoothed with a 0.2 s moving average filter. One can see the very good correlation between 121 the parameters retrieved for the two different FFUs. Some periodicity between 3 and 4 s can be seen 122 in the electron density, especially between 150 and 190 s. Such periods are similar to the FFU spin 123 rate (\sim 3.4 s) and could be due to the ambient electric field affecting the probe biases: although the 124 probe bias was corrected for this effect using the electric field probe measurements, some residual 125 126 might remain thus propagating to the retrieved plasma parameters.



Figure 2. Time-series of the retrieved plasma parameters: electron density (a), electron temperature (b) and plasma potential with respect to hull potential (c). Solid lines show the average of the parameters obtained from the two fittings taken with different sheath thickness assumption (s=1.0 and s=1.5, see Appendix A). Shaded areas show the uncertainty taken as the difference between the mean and the results of the two fittings (s=1.0and s=1.5). The vertical orange and green dash lines at 198 s and 218 s followed by the respective shaded columns refer to two events further discussed in Section 5.

4 Comparison with EISCAT incoherent scatter radar measurements

The EISCAT UHF facility in Tromsø, Norway, provided incoherent scatter radar measurements 134 along the up-leg path of the rocket. The electron density and temperature were obtained from these 135 measurements and compared to the plasma parameters obtained by the FFUs. Figure 3 displays the 136 EISCAT measurements around the rocket's apogee along side the electron density and temperature 137 for each FFU from Figure 2. Both measurements depicts a similar structure of the aurora, with a 138 hot electron temperature around 1000 K above 110 km, with density around 5×10^{11} m⁻³, and a 139 drop of both the density and the temperature (down to 400 K) in the down-leg part of the trajectory, 140 below 110 km. This boundary between these two regions probably being the horizontal edge of the 141 aurora. The remote measurements from EISCAT are another independent confirmation validating 142 the plasma parameters measured by the FFUs. 143



Figure 3. Snapshot of the electron density (left panels) and electron temperature (right panels) recorded by EISCAT along the up-leg part of the trajectory (top panels) and by the FFUs along the down-leg part of the trajectory (bottom panels). The yellow dots show the position of the FFUs at the time of the EISCAT measurement.

¹⁴⁸ 5 Hall current and turbulence inside a local plasma density enhancement

With confidence in the FFU measurements, a more detailed interpretation of the time-series 149 shown in Figure 2 can be conducted. Two particular events can be seen in the time-series: a sharp 150 decrease of the density and temperature with a rapid recovery around 198 s, and a significant increase 151 in the density accompanied with a decrease in the electron temperature after 218 s and until \sim 240 s. 152 These two events could either be spatial structures (e.g. auroral curtain), which of the FFUs were 153 crossing, or temporal variation of the aurora (e.g. local precipitation along a field line). The second 154 option is most likely for the first event, as the spatial scales on which the temperature drastically 155 changes is less than a kilometer. This interpretation is also supported by the fact that no time-delay 156 is seen between both FFUs, which were separated spatially by about 500 m in the horizontal plane. 157 Interestingly, the change in the electron temperature seems to lead the change in density, as it can be 158 seen to start increasing around 198 s while the electron density increased only ~ 0.5 s later. On the 159 other hand the second event seems to be a local plasma density enhancement on larger spatial scale, 160 e.g. a vertical auroral curtain crossed by the two FFUs along their down-leg parabolic trajectory, or a 161 horizontal layer of enhanced ionisation (i.e. energy deposition region) in which the FFUs entered-in 162 during the down-leg part of the trajectory. It is important to point out that, although the temporal 163 resolution of the retrieved electron density and temperature was 0.05 s, no timing difference could 164 be detected between the two FFUs. This indicates that these events were either faster (likely for the 165 event at 198 s) or homogeneous on horizontal spatial scales between 100 and 1000 m, the horizontal 166 separation between the FFUs (likely for the event between 218 and 240 s). 167

A closer look at context ground-based images from the Auroral Large Imaging System (ALIS, [*Brändström*, 2003]) provided additional hints to help interpreting this event. ALIS consists of four

imaging CCD cameras located around Kiruna. The systems provided multi-angle observations of 170 the aurora green-line emission with a 10 s temporal resolution. Due to bad weather condition, only 171 two out of the four stations could perform clear observation of the surge at the time of the flight. 172 Nonetheless, a tomography-like reconstruction of the volume emission rate was carried out, and an 173 overview around 200-260 s after lift-off is shown in Figure 4. One can see the volume emission 174 rate increasing by a factor of two between 220 and 240 s, right where the electron density is also 175 seen to double by the FFUs. The nature of this increase was further investigating by looking at the 176 spatial and temporal variation of the volume emission rate, shown in Figure 5. The right column in 177 Figure 5 clearly shows the FFUs entering a horizontal layer around 220 s where the volume emission 178 increases by about two folds. The FFUs then exited this horizontal layer around 250 s. The westward 179 motion of the aurora can be guessed in the left column of Figure 5 but does not seems to be the major 180 contributor to the emission rate increase, thus ruling-out the vertical curtain possibility. The layer 181 between 110 and 130 km have an emission rate ~ 1.5 times larger than the layers above and below 182 these heights. In addition, the emission rate of this layer appears to increase by about 10 to 30%183 between 210 and 240 s compared before and after. The overall intensity of the auroral activity also 184 greatly dropped after 250 s. Hence, the higher electron density seen by the FFUs around 220 s is 185 likely due to an horizontal layer of enhanced ionisation as well as to a temporal increase in electron 186 precipitation. 187

¹⁸⁸ Note that ALIS did not provide enough temporal resolution to resolve the first event short ¹⁸⁹ duration (\sim 1 s). However, the presence of an horizontal layer can be ruled out in this case, as such ¹⁹⁰ layers are unlikely of occur on such small scale height.



Figure 4. Tomography-like reconstruction of the aurora from ALIS observations. Each layer shows the volume emission rate for the various altitude, each taken at the time indicated on the z-axis. The black line shows the rocket trajectory, with the colored dots indicating the locations of the FFUs at each time.



Figure 5. Timeline of the tomography-like reconstruction of the aurora from ALIS observations. The left column shows the top view integrated from 105 and 140° km altitude. The right column shows the vertical plane along the rocket trajectory. The red dots shows the positions of the FFUs at each time along the trajectory, represented by the red line. The origin is centered on Esrange.

The horizontal layer with enhanced plasma density was investigate further by comparing the 198 retrieved plasma parameters to the magnetic field measured by the SMILE fluxgate magnetometer, 199 also onboard each FFU. Figure 6(a) and (c) shows the electron density and temperature while (d) 200 shows the residual of the total magnetic field measured by the magnetometer after removing the expected field from the International Geomagnetic Reference Field (IGRF) model [Macmillan et al., 202 2003] along the FFU trajectory. The total magnetic field in the density enhanced layer appears to 203 be about 15 nT lower than expected from the model. This is an indication of Hall current in the 204 region: a reduction of the magnetic field (along mostly the upward direction) is the results of an 205 increased counter-clockwise ExB drift of the electron due to an increased electron current, e.g. from 206 electron precipitation. Interestingly, the magnetic field perturbation does not set right when the FFUs 207 encounter the over-dense region but lag slightly behind, about ~ 4 s (*i.e.* $\sim 3-4$ km vertically inside 208 the layer). The magnetic field perturbation also seems to recover later (*i.e.* at lower heights) than the density: around 250 s compared to 240 s, which corresponds to roughly 10 km. 210

In addition, the plasma irregularities of the density enhancement region can also be studied 211 using the electron density measurement. This is achieved by performing a Fast Fourier Transform of 212 the detrended relative density on a 2 s moving window, following the method described by Spicher 213 et al. [2014]. First the electron density in the 2 s window is detrended by removing a fitted linear 214 relationship, effectively removing the very low frequencies. The detrended electron density is then 215 normalized by its standard deviation and a Hanning window is applied to reduce edge irregularities 216 effect before performing the Fast Fourier Transform. The slope of the resulting power spectrum 217 contains information about how the energy dissipates locally, and Kintner and Seyler [1985] showed 218 that this can be related to plasma instabilities, as different instabilities lead to different dissipation 219 rates. Note that in the case of SPIDER's Langmuir probes, the slope was estimated from 1 Hz 220 up to the Nyquist frequency of 10 Hz only, as the sampling rate of the *I-V* curves was limited to 221 20 Hz. Thus, the veracity of the results should be considered with caution. Nevertheless, the slope of 222 detrended relative density power spectrum for both FFUs is shown in Figure 6(b). A slope of -5/3223 can be seen in the stable region before 218 s, which is the signature of the typical Kolmogorov 224 turbulent regime. However, the slope decreases to -11/3 in the region with enhanced density after 225 218 s. According to *Kintner and Seyler* [1985], this could be interpreted as a sign of a drift wave 226 instability. In conclusion, the event starting at 218 s can be interpreted as a crossing of the FFUs 227 into a horizontal layer of enhanced density at the same time as a temporal increase in electron 228 precipitation. The higher precipitation in this layer induced Hall current, reducing the ambient 229 magnetic field while also introducing a different turbulence regime by possibly fueling drift-wave 230 instabilities. This is further supported by the fact that both the magnetic field perturbation and the 231 measure of the turbulence regime seem to be correlated, both recovering around 250 s compared to 232 240 s for the density enhancement. 233



Figure 6. Time series for the electron density (a), the slope of the detrended relative density power spectrum (b), the electron temperature (c) and the total magnetic field residual (d), for FFU02 (blue) and FFU06 (red). The vertical orange dash line at 198 s shows the first event, with a decrease in density and temperature followed by a sharp increased in temperature with delayed increase in density (shown by the orange shaded column). The vertical green dash line at 218 s indicates the start of the second event, *i.e.* the density enhancement region, shown by the green shaded column until 240 s.

240 6 Conclusion

The SPIDER sounding rocket presented the first in situ multi-point measurements of the plasma 241 properties and electric field inside an auroral electrojet. Although only six of the ten ejected free 242 falling units were recovered, and beside some issues during the flight (*i.e.* unexpectedly large pay-243 load charging saturating the recorded current and wobble-induced short-circuits), usable Langmuir 244 probe measurements were obtained on two different FFUs. Due to a intermediate plasma regime 245 where the thickness of the plasma sheath was comparable to the probe radius, the full analytical for-246 mulation of ion collecting by a moving spherical body was used to interpret the measured current. 247 An empirical estimation of the sheath thickness was required to perform the fitting of the I-V curves. 248 Empirically, values between 10 and 20 mm were used (depending on the probe potential with re-249 spect to plasma). Indirect confirmation of this assumption was obtained by modelling the FFU and 250 Langmuir probe using the SPIS software, providing good match to the *I*-V curve measurements and 251 the sheath thickness used for the fitting and thus bolstering the confidence in the analytical results. 252

In addition, a direct confirmation of the plasma parameters retrieved by the FFUs was provided by incoherent scatter radar measurements along the rocket path from the EISCAT facility in Tromsø. Both measurements were not exactly taken at the same time, with EISCAT sampling the up-leg while the useful Langmuir probe measurements from the FFUs were taken mostly during the down-leg. Yet, the magnitude and structure of the electron density and temperature as a function of altitude is comparable: both detected a denser $(6 \times 10^{11} \text{ m}^{-3})$ and hotter (1000 K) electron population above 120 km compared to a less dense $(1-2 \times 10^{11} \text{ m}^{-3})$ and cooler (400 K) below.

Thus, with confidence in the FFU measurements, two events were discussed in more details. 260 First, a sharp decrease in both electron density and temperature was seen around 198 s after launch. This event happened on a 1-2 km spatial scale, and is therefore likely to be of temporal nature, 262 e.g. local precipitation along a field line. The second event occurred at 218 s after launch, where 263 a significant increase in electron density can be seen for more than 20-30 s. The increased density 264 is accompanied by a large decrease in the electron temperature. A tomography-like reconstruction 265 of the auroral volume emission rate based on the ground-based observation from the ALIS system 266 confirmed that this increase in electron density was due to the FFUs entering an horizontal layer 267 between 120 and 130 km with larger emission rate. ALIS also revealed a temporal increase of the volume emission rate in this layer around the same time, thus indicating larger electron precipitation. 269 The measured magnetic field inside the layer was seen to be ~ 15 nT less than the expected magnetic 270 field from the IGRF model, indicating a Hall current is produced by the increased electron precip-271 itation in the layer. In addition, the power spectrum of the electron density variations was studied 272 to look for hints of turbulence, and a different slope of -11/3 compared to the typical Kolmogorov 273 regime of -5/3 was observed. Such power spectrum slope could be an indication of drift wave 274 instabilities, possibly induced by the increased electron precipitation. 275

In conclusion, this article demonstrated the need for instruments with high spatial and temporal resolutions to investigate auroral multi-scale processes. In this respect, sounding rocket are the ideal platform to carry such instruments. This work also pointed out the important of utilising ground-based facilities (ALIS and EISCAT) to provide context observations to the rocket-borne measurements.

A Retrieval of the plasma parameters: ion accelerated current and sheath thickness assumption.

This section presents the details of the plasma parameters retrieval, in particular the expression of the ion accelerated current I_{acc} and the assumption taken regarding the sheath thickness around the probe.

Assuming no collisions take place inside the sheath and the particle distribution outside the sheath is Maxwellian with a superimposed drift velocity, the general formulation of I_{acc} for a moving spherical probe was given by *Warthon and Hoegy* [1971]

$$\begin{split} I_{acc} &= \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{(M^{2} + \frac{1}{2})}{M} \operatorname{erf}(M) \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{W}{2M} \left[\operatorname{erf}(M - \gamma W^{1/2}) + \operatorname{erf}(M + \gamma W^{1/2})\right] + \frac{1}{2} e^{-M^{2}}\right] \\ &- \left(\left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^{2} - 1\right) \left[\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{(M^{2} + \frac{1}{2} + W)}{2M} \left[\operatorname{erf}(M - \gamma W^{1/2}) + \operatorname{erf}(M + \gamma W^{1/2})\right] \\ &+ \frac{M + \gamma W^{1/2}}{4M} e^{-(M - \gamma W^{1/2})^{2}} + \frac{M - \gamma W^{1/2}}{4M} e^{-(M + \gamma W^{1/2})^{2}}\right] \end{split}$$
(A.1)

in which the variables W, M, γ and a are defined as

$$W = \frac{\mathbf{e} | (V - V_{\mathbf{p}}) |}{\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{B}} T_{\mathbf{i}}}, \quad M = \frac{m_{\mathbf{i}} v^2}{2\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{B}} T_{\mathbf{i}}}, \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(a/r)^2 - 1}}, \quad a = r + h$$

where h is the sheath thickness, v is the velocity of the probe inside the plasma, and m_i the mass of 286 the ions. Here, v was obtained from FFU GPS recordings, and m_i is taken as 31 atomic unit which 287 is the average mass of the two most common species of ions at this altitude: O_2^+ and NO⁺. Note 288 that this expression greatly simplified in the thin-sheath region $(a/r \rightarrow 1)$ or the large-sheath region (a/r >> 1) and respectively reduces to similar expression as presented by Sagalyn et al. [1963] 290 and Fahleson et al. [1974]. It is important to notice that Equation (A.1) is expressed as a function 291 of the ion temperature T_i . However, the Bohm criterion [*Riemann*, 1991] implies that, in order for 292 the sheath to be stable, only ions with a velocity large enough to overcome the electrostatic potential 293 of the sheath are able to reach the probe. This threshold velocity corresponds to a equivalent ion 294 thermal motion induced by a temperature of at least $T_{\rm e}/2$. Hence, one interpretation is that ions are 295 accelerated towards the probe by the pre-sheath potential. Collectively, the collected ions can be 296 seen to have a temperature equal or larger than $T_{\rm e}/2$. This temperature is higher than for the undis-297 turbed ions far from the probe, thus making the true ion temperature impossible to evaluate in this 298 intermediate sheath regime. Following this assumption, every instances of T_i in the expression of W 299 and M was replaced by $T_{\rm e}/2$ instead, making the ion current a function of the electron temperature. 300

An estimation of the sheath thickness h is required in order to use Equation (A.1). The general sheath equation was given by *Chen* [1979] in a one-dimensional case as

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\eta}{d\xi}\right)^2 = \mathfrak{M}^2 \left[\sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{2\eta}{\mathfrak{M}^2}\right)} - 1 \right] + e^{-\eta} - 1 \tag{A.2}$$

where the variables ξ , η and \mathfrak{M} are

$$\xi = \frac{h}{\lambda_{\rm Ds}}, \quad \lambda_{\rm Ds} = \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_0 \mathbf{k}_{\rm B} T_{\rm e}}{e^2 n_{\rm s}}}, \quad \eta = \frac{e|V - V_{\rm p}|}{\mathbf{k}_{\rm B} T_{\rm e}}, \quad \mathfrak{M} = \sqrt{\frac{m_{\rm i} v_{\rm i}^2}{\mathbf{k}_{\rm B} T_{\rm e}}}.$$

In these variables, λ_{Ds} is the Debye length estimated at the sheath edge where $n_{\text{s}} = e^{-1/2} \times n_{\text{e}}$, ε_0 is the vacuum permittivity and v_{i} is the velocity of the ions. An important simplification is taken here: Equation A.2 was derived for a one-dimensional case but is here applied to a three-dimensional case. The spherical symmetry of the SPIDER probes is used to assume the three-dimensional case to be equal to a one-dimensional case along the radial direction.

A relationship between η and ξ can be obtained by numerically integrating the following differential equation

$$d\eta/d\xi = \sqrt{2} \left[\sqrt{1+2\eta} + e^{-\eta} - 2 \right]^{1/2} + s$$
(A.3)

where s corresponds to the slope of the electrostatic potential at the edge of the sheath. One can 306 notice that this expression tends towards the Child-Langmuir law for large value of ($\eta > 100$) but 307 diverges depending on the value of s for smaller η where the Child-Langmuir law is not valid any 308 more. Here, η is expected to be between 1 and 20, for the two extreme cases where the probe 309 potential and electron temperature are 0.1 V and 1000 K, and 0.7 V and 400 K, respectively. Hence, 310 the parameter s cannot be neglected in the presented case. Estimating this parameter solely based 311 on the I-V curve is impossible since such measurement does not contain any direct information 312 about the shape of the potential around the probe. However, leaving it as a free parameter to be 313 fitted along side with the other plasma parameters leads to unrealistic results, as it competes with 314 $T_{\rm e}$. Although s is not necessarily constant along the trajectory, as the shape of the potential around 315 the probe could be influenced by the plasma environment, one can assume that the influence of the 316 external magnetic field and of the probe properties (e.g. capacitance, surface roughness, etc.) are 317 the main factors affecting the shape of the potential. In this case, the assumption of a constant s can 318 be taken. Note that a constant s does not imply a constant sheath thickness, as the plasma density, 319 temperature, and the probe bias potential, are present in Equation (A.3). 320

Figure A.1 shows three examples of measured I-V curves taken at different times during the flight. The potential of the probe is expressed with respect to the hull potential after correction of two effects: the charging of the hull (~-0.8 V) and the ambient electric field (up to ± 0.03 V depending

on the orientation of the probe). The influence of changing the probe bias steps on the hull charging 324 was negligible ($\sim 10 \text{ mV}$) and not included in the correction. Fittings using constant s values from 325 0.25 to 2 are shown in Figure A.1. One can see that values of s below 1 do not match the trend seen 326 in the ion saturation. Overall, larger values of s provide a better fit to the measured I-V curves, 327 while reporting higher electron density, electron temperature and plasma potential. However, larger 328 values of s imply a sharper potential drop at the sheath edge which is physically unlikely. Thus, the 329 smallest values of s which gives a reasonable fit to the measured ion saturation current should be 330 used. 331



Figure A.1. Example of I-V curves measured by FFU06 at (a) 153 s, (b) 198 s and (c) 235 s. Blue dots shows the measured current, while solid lines from blue to red shows the fitting for s from 0.25 to 2.00.

In the case of SPIDER, a *s* value between 1 and 1.5 provided a satisfying fit for the I-Vcurves along the entire flight while keeping *s* relatively small. The mean value obtained from fitting Equation (1) with *s* equal to 1 and 1.5 was considered for the mean plasma parameters, while the difference gauged the uncertainty of the method on each of the plasma parameters.

B Confirmation with SPIS simulation

Results from Appendix A are based on an empirical value of s which dictates the shape of the 339 electrostatic potential around the probe. This leads to a sheath thickness between 6 to 18 mm for 340 the probe bias between +0.7 V and +0.1 V, respectively (when considering a charging of the hull to 341 -0.8 V and a plasma potential around -0.35 V). Hybrid plasma simulations using the Spacecraft 342 Plasma Interaction Software [SPIS, Roussel et al., 2008] were used to confirm the assumption 343 taken. A model of the FFU with one of its spherical Langmuir probe was simulated inside a plasma 344 of similar density and temperature as derived in Section 3, *i.e.* n_e equals to 5× 10¹¹ m⁻³ and 345 $T_{\rm e}$ equals to 900 K. The FFU was given an horizontal velocity of 500 m/s, similar to the velocity 346 347 around the apogee, while the plasma was kept stationary in the simulated volume, thus including the ion ram-current. Figure B.1 shows the geometry of the configuration by displaying the shape of 348 the electrostatic potential in two perpendicular planes. A rougher mesh was used around the FFU 349 compared to the finer mesh around the probe, as the main interest was to investigate the plasma 350 sheath around the latter. 351



Figure B.1. XZ (top) and XY (bottom) cut of the simulated plasma potential around the disc-shape FFU (on the left) and the spherical Langmuir probe (on the right, 1 m away).

The simulation provided the current collected by each surface, as well as the spatial distribution of the potential, electron density and ion density around the probe. Several runs were performed for

biases of the probe ranging from -0.5 to +0.2 V with respect to the FFU body. The simulated 356 payload charging was around -0.35 V with respect to plasma potential, which is only about half 357 the one observed in flight by the electric field probes. Nonetheless, both the simulated floating 358 potential with respect to plasma potential and collected current by the probe were very similar to the 359 measured one, as is shown in Figure B.2(a). The error bars are the 2- σ error calculated based on the 360 fluctuation of the collected current during the part of each simulation run after which the equilibrium 361 state if the plasma was achieved. Errors mostly come from ions due to the particle-in-cell approach 362 taken to simulate their motion, thus increasing the fluctuation of the collected current between each 363 timestep. In addition, the sheath thickness was obtained for each of these cases, determined as 364 the distance from the probe where the electron density (averaged radially around the probe) drops 365 below 60% of its undisturbed value ($e^{-1/2} \times n_e$, as defined by *Chen* [1979]). The simulated sheath 366 thickness was compared to the values used during the analytical fitting with s equal to 1 and 1.5, 367 as presented in Figure B.2(b). Again, a good agreement is seen between the simulation and the 368 analytical method, especially for larger potential difference. This can be explained as the simulation 369 struggles to properly define the sheath when the probe potential approaches the plasma potential, 370 where the sheath collapses (*i.e.* start of the electron saturation). Error bars are the corresponding 371 372 $2-\sigma$ error derived from the $2-\sigma$ error on the average radial electron density, itself calculated as the standard deviation of the electron density profiles in all radial directions. 373



Figure B.2. (a) Comparison between measured, fitted and simulated *I*-*V* curves. Blue dots shows a measured *I*-*V* curve from FFU06. The blue, green, orange and red solid lines shows the fitting with *s* equal to 0.5, 1, 1.5 and 2.0, respectively. Grey dots show the simulated *I*-*V* curve from SPIS, with $\pm 2-\sigma$ error bars. (b) Comparison between the sheath thickness assumed for the analytical retrieval of the plasma parameters and the simulated sheath thickness for similar plasma parameters using SPIS. The blue, green, orange and red solid lines show the fitting with *s* equal to 0.5, 1, 1.5 and 2.0, respectively. Grey dots show the simulated sheath thickness with $\pm 2-\sigma$ error bars.

Moreover, the simulated potential around the probe was used to estimate the value of *s*. Figure B.3(a) shows the radial electron distribution around the probe (mean and $\pm 2-\sigma$ limits) for a probe bias of -0.4 V with respect to the hull. Based on the criteria from *Chen* [1979] the sheath thickness was estimated between 12.6 and 17.8 mm. The shape of the potential around the probe (mean and

- $\pm 2-\sigma$ limits) is shown in Figure B.3(b). s is calculated as the first derivative of the normalized po-
- tential (*i.e.* $d\eta/d\xi$) and estimated for the minimum, mean and maximum cases of both the sheath
- thickness and the potential as 0.06, 0.33 and 0.91, respectively. The slope of the simulated potential
- at the sheath edge is not as sharp as expected from the analytical expression, with values of s likely
- closer to 0.5. Nevertheless, a *s* value around unity is still within the simulation uncertainty.



Figure B.3. (a) Simulated radial electron density distribution around the probe for a probe bias of -0.4 V with respect to the hull. The blue shaded area shows the ± 2 - σ uncertainty. The threshold for the sheath thickness is $3 \times 10^{11} \text{ m}^{-3}$ (i.e. $\sim e^{-1/2} \times n_e$), leading to a sheath thickness between 12.6 and 17.8 mm. (b) Simulated radial potential profile around the probe for a probe bias of -0.4 V with respect to the hull. The blue shaded area shows the ± 2 - σ uncertainty. The orange, red and magenta dots shows the value of *s* (*i.e.* derivative of the potential at the sheath edge) for the upper, mean and lower cases corresponding to the sheath thickness uncertainty from (a).

Although the SPIS simulation did not reproduce the exact payload charging observed during flight, it provides compelling evidence to support the analytical method used to interpret the flight measurements, both in term of the collected current by the probe and of the sheath thickness around it. The simulated potential at the sheath edge is not as sharp as the values used analytically, with *s* values between 0.1 and 1.0 compared to 1.0 and 1.5. This might be due to a discrepancy between the
 1-D analytical expression and the 3-D simulation. On the other hand, the simulated sheath thickness
 still matches the analytical cases with *s* between 1.0 and 1.5. However, this confirms that a sharp

 $_{404}$ potential at the sheath edge is unphysical, and therefore large values of s should not be considered.

405 Acknowledgments

The work was partially supported by the Swedish Government Agency for Innovation Systems

- (VINNOVA) contract no. 2016-04094. The SPIDER sounding rocket project was supported by
 the Swedish National Space Agency. The data from the SPIDER sounding rocket used in this article
- the Swedish National Space Agency. The data from the SPIDER sounding
 is hosted by the Swedish National Data Service under SND-ID: 2021-38.

410 **References**

- ⁴¹¹ Oppenheim, M. M. and Dimant, Y. S. (2013). Kinetic simulations of 3-D Farley-Buneman ⁴¹² turbulence and anomalous electron heating. *J. Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 118, ⁴¹³ doi:10.1002/jgra.50196
- Warthon, L. E. and Hoegy, W. R. (1971). Current to moving spherical and cylindrical electrostatic
 probes. *NASA Goddard Space Flight Center internal report*, X-621-71-276
- Sagalyn, R. C., Smiddy, M. and Wisnia, J. (1963). Measurement and interpretation of ion density
 distribution in the daytime F region. *J. Geophysical Research*, 68
- Fahleson, U., Falthammar, C. G. and Pedersen, A. (1974). Ionospheric temperature and density measurements by means of spherical double probes. *Planet. Space Sci.*, 22
- Pedersen, A. et al. (2008). Electron density estimations derived from spacecraft potential measurements on Cluster in tenuous plasma regions. J. Geophysical Research, 113,
 doi:10.1029/2007JA012636
- Roussel, J.-F. et al. (2008). SPIS Open Source Code: Methods, Capabilities, Achievements and Prospects. *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, 36, 2360-2368, doi:10.1109/TPS.2008.2002327
- Chen, F. (1979). Thickness of combined Bohm-Langmuir sheaths. *Unclassified TRW report*, Task
 II-2186, url:http://www.seas.ucla.edu/ ffchen/Archive/Chen087.pdf
- Mott-Smith, H. M. and Langmuir, I. (1926). The theory of collectors in gaseous discharges. *Physical Review*, 28, 727-763
- Riemann, K. U. (1991). The Bohm criterion and sheath formation. J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys, 24, 493, doi:10.1088/0022-3727/24/4/001
- Barjatya, A. and Swenson, C. M. (2006). Observations of triboelectric charging effects on Langmuir type probes in dusty plasma. J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys, 111, A10302, doi:10.1029/2006JA011806
- Brändström, U. (2003). The Auroral Large Imaging System Design, Operation and Scientific Re sults. *PhD thesis*, IRF Scientific Report 279, ISBN 91-7305-405-4, Kiruna
- Kintner, P. M. and Seyler, C. E. (1985). The status of observations and theory of high lati tude ionospheric and magnetospheric plasma turbulence. *Space Science Reviews*, 41, 91-129, doi:10.1007/BF00241347
- Spicher, A., Miloch, W. J. and Moen, J. I. (2014). Direct evidence of double-slope power
 spectra in the high-latitude ionospheric plasma. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 1406–1412, doi:10.1002/2014GL059214
- Bondar, Macmillan. S., Maus, S., T. et al. (2003). Ninth Generation Inter-442 national Geomagnetic Reference Field Released. AGU,81. 46. 503-503. 443 url:https://ccmc.gsfc.nasa.gov/models/modelinfo.php?model=IGRF 444