# Energy partition at collisionless supercritical quasiperpendicular shocks

Steven J. Schwartz<sup>1,1</sup>, Katherine Amanda Goodrich<sup>2,2</sup>, Lynn B Wilson III<sup>3,3</sup>, Drew L. Turner<sup>4,4</sup>, Karlheinz Trattner<sup>5,5</sup>, Harald Kucharek<sup>6,6</sup>, Imogen Gingell<sup>7,7</sup>, Stephen A. Fuselier<sup>8,8</sup>, Ian James Cohen<sup>4,4</sup>, Hadi Madanian<sup>5,5</sup>, Robert E Ergun<sup>9,9</sup>, Daniel J Gershman<sup>3,3</sup>, and Robert J. Strangeway<sup>10,10</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Colorado Boulder
<sup>2</sup>University of California, Berkeley
<sup>3</sup>NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
<sup>4</sup>The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
<sup>5</sup>Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics
<sup>6</sup>University of New Hampshire, USA
<sup>7</sup>School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton
<sup>8</sup>Southwest Research Institute
<sup>9</sup>University of Colorado
<sup>10</sup>University of California Los Angeles

November 30, 2022

#### Abstract

Collisionless shocks in astrophysical plasmas are important thermalizers, converting some of the incident flow energy into thermal energy, and non-thermalizers, partitioning that energy in unequal ways to different particle species, sub-populations thereof, and field components. This partition problem, or equivalently the shock equation of state, lies at the heart of shock physics. Here we employ systematically a framework to capture all the incident and downstream energy fluxes at two example traversals of the Earth's bow shock by the Magnetospheric Multiscale Mission. Here and traditionally such data has to be augmented by information from other spacecraft, e.g., to provide more accurate measurements of the cold solar wind beam. With some care and fortuitous choices, the energy fluxes are constant, including instantaneous measurements through the shock layer. The dominant incident proton ram energy is converted primarily into downstream proton enthalpy flux, the majority of which is actually carried by a small fraction of suprathermal protons. Fluctuations include both real and instrumental effects. Separating these, resolving the solar wind beam, and other considerations point the way to a dedicated mission to solve this energy partition problem across a full range of plasma and shock conditions.

# Energy partition at collisionless supercritical quasiperpendicular shocks

Steven J Schwartz<sup>1\*†</sup>, Katherine A Goodrich<sup>2</sup>, Lynn B Wilson III<sup>3</sup>, Drew L
 Turner<sup>4</sup>, Karlheinz J Trattner<sup>1</sup>, Harald Kucharek<sup>5</sup>, Imogen Gingell<sup>6</sup>, Stephen
 A Fuselier<sup>7,8</sup>, Ian J Cohen<sup>4</sup>, Hadi Madanian<sup>1</sup>, Robert E Ergun<sup>1</sup>, Daniel J
 Gershman<sup>3</sup>, Robert J Strangeway<sup>9</sup>

7	<sup>1</sup> Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics, CU Boulder, Boulder, CO
8	$^2\mathrm{Deptartment}$ of Physics and Astronomy, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV
9	<sup>3</sup> Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD
10	$^4\mathrm{Space}$ Exploration Sector, The Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, MD
11	<sup>5</sup> University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH
12	$^6\mathrm{School}$ of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
13	<sup>7</sup> Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX
14	$^{8}\mathrm{The}$ University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX USA
15	<sup>9</sup> UCLA, Los Angeles, CA

Key Points:
We establish and apply a framework to quantify total energy partition across collisionless shocks.
The fragmented suprathermal ions at the shock and downstream dominate the energy budget.
Present instrument limitations suggest a roadmap for next generation shock-dedical

1

2

16

17

18

19

20

23

Present instrument limitations suggest a roadmap for next generation shock-dedicated
 space missions.

Manuscript Date 7 May 2022; REVISED 28 July 2022

<sup>\*</sup>Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics, CU Boulder, Boulder, CO

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Also Emeritus Professor, Imperial College London

 $Corresponding \ author: \ Steven \ Schwartz, \ \texttt{steven.schwartz@lasp.colorado.edu}$ 

#### 24 Abstract

Collisionless shocks in astrophysical plasmas are important thermalizers, converting some 25 of the incident flow energy into thermal energy, and non-thermalizers, partitioning that 26 energy in unequal ways to different particle species, sub-populations thereof, and field 27 components. This partition problem, or equivalently the shock equation of state, lies at 28 the heart of shock physics. Here we employ systematically a framework to capture all 29 the incident and downstream energy fluxes at two example traversals of the Earth's bow 30 shock by the Magnetospheric Multiscale Mission. Here and traditionally such data has 31 to be augmented by information from other spacecraft, e.g., to provide more accurate 32 measurements of the cold solar wind beam. With some care and fortuitous choices, the 33 total energy flux is conserved, including instantaneous measurements through the shock 34 layer. The dominant incident proton ram energy is converted primarily into downstream 35 proton enthalpy flux, the majority of which is actually carried by a small fraction of suprather-36 mal protons. Fluctuations include both real and instrumental effects. Separating these, 37 resolving the solar wind beam, and other considerations point the way to a dedicated 38 mission to solve this energy partition problem across a full range of plasma and shock 39 conditions. 40

41

## Plain Language Summary

Explosions and fast flows in astrophysical environments lead to the formation of 42 shock waves, the role of which is to process the energy incident upon them. In most as-43 trophysical plasmas, the densities are so low that particle collisions are negligibly rare. 44 Such plasmas are incapable of establishing an equilibrium at a constant temperature across 45 electron and ion species. Astrophysical shocks therefore channel some of that incident 46 energy, for example, to accelerate high energy cosmic rays, and otherwise partition the 47 energy amongst the plasma's many constituents. This paper addresses from a holistic 48 approach this partition problem by employing a mathematical framework to analyze data 49 from state of the art spacecraft that traverse shock waves in interplanetary space. We 50 successfully verify, with some assumptions, overall energy conservation. We also iden-51 tify sub-portions and features of the proton population that receive a disproportionate 52 share of the incident energy. The approach naturally highlights the critical measurements 53 and reveals limitations of using some instruments in regimes for which they were not de-54

-2-

signed. A dedicated satellite mission to study shock physics would overcome these dif ficulties.

#### 1 Introduction

57

Shock waves in astrophysical plasmas are almost always operating on scales that 58 are much smaller than the particle collisional mean free path. Such collisionless shocks 59 require plasma kinetic processes to decelerate the incident bulk flow and "dissipate" that 60 incident energy flux. These processes operate differently on the different plasma species 61 and electromagnetic fields, and over different scales. They are responsible for preferen-62 tial heating together with the acceleration to high energies of sub-populations of parti-63 cles (Kucharek et al., 2003). This unknown partitioning of the incident energy lies at the 64 heart of the shock problem. The bow shock formed by the interaction of the supersonic 65 solar wind flow with the Earth's magnetosphere has long been a prime laboratory for 66 investigating collisionless shock physics thanks to its accessibility by ever-increasingly 67 high-quality in situ satellite observations (Burgess & Scholer, 2015; Schwartz, 2006; Schwartz 68 et al., 2013; Krasnoselskikh et al., 2013; Tsurutani & Stone, 1985; Stone & Tsurutani, 69 1985; Scudder, Mangeney, Lacombe, Harvey, Wu, & Anderson, 1986). 70

Most shock studies have concentrated on a variety of processes that are believed 71 to play a role in the collisionless shock problem, including ion reflection (Woods, 1969; 72 Paschmann et al., 1982; Sckopke et al., 1983), DC fields (Scudder, Mangeney, Lacombe, 73 Harvey, & Aggson, 1986; Gedalin, 2020; Schwartz et al., 2021), micro-instabilities and 74 turbulence (Scudder, Mangeney, Lacombe, Harvey, & Aggson, 1986; Wilson et al., 2014; 75 Goodrich et al., 2018), particle acceleration (Amano et al., 2020; Kucharek et al., 2004; 76 Kis et al., 2004), non-stationarity/shock reformation (Johlander et al., 2018; Madanian, 77 Desai, et al., 2021), magnetic reconnection (Gingell et al., 2019, 2020; Wang et al., 2019) 78 and others. Some statistical studies have focused on isolated aspects of the partition prob-79 lem, such as the parametric dependence of the downstream electron temperature on up-80 stream conditions (Schwartz et al., 1988), the statistics of electron distribution functions 81 at interplanetary shocks (Wilson et al., 2019b, 2019a, 2020), the percentage of reflected 82 ions as a function of Mach number (Leroy et al., 1982), or the amount of energy given 83 to energetic particles (David et al., 2022). In such studies, the basic shock parameters 84 (Mach number, plasma  $\beta$ , shock geometry, electron to ion temperature ratio) are eval-85

-3-

uated through careful use of the Rankine Hugoniot fluid shock jump conditions to sup plement and cross-check observed quantities.

While we have learned much about the physics of collisionless shocks through such 88 studies, the fundamental energy partition problem has been somewhat neglected (see David 89 et al. (2022) for a recent attempt focused on energetic particle production using a Rank-90 ine Hugoniot approach). This is due, perhaps, to the comprehensive and accurate simul-91 taneous measurements that are required to fully characterize the upstream and down-92 stream states. For example, the dominant energy flux incident on the bow shock is the 93 solar wind proton ram energy, and the dominant downstream energy flux is the result 94 of proton heating by the shock reflection and other processes. However the total energy 95 budget includes nonthermal features in both the upstream and downstream proton dis-96 tributions together with other particle species (electrons,  $\alpha$ -particles and other minor ions), 97 accelerated sub-populations of particles, and DC and AC Poynting fluxes. For some con-98 texts, such as astrophysical cosmic ray production, it is important not just to know the 99 dominant energy flux carriers but also, e.g., the energetic particle fluxes and their de-100 pendencies on shock parameters. 101

These considerations lead us to lay down a comprehensive framework for keeping 102 track of as many different energy fluxes as possible and to study their variability with 103 shock parameters. This approach is challenging at even the most accessible of shocks, 104 the terrestrial bow shock, for several reasons. Resolving the cold, super-thermal solar 105 wind proton beam and tracking the proton velocity distributions as they get ripped apart, 106 mixed and partially thermalized through and downstream of the shock requires dedicated 107 and well-cross-calibrated solar wind and  $4\pi$  detectors not available on most modern space 108 plasma missions. Measuring the Poynting flux requires good 3D electric and magnetic 109 field measurements, both AC and DC. Resolving velocity space features of  $\alpha$ -particles 110 and other minor species in the solar wind is challenging. Critically, evaluating the ki-111 netic processes responsible for the energy partition through the shock transition layer 112 demands electron scale (1 s or less) temporal resolution for most parameters. No current 113 space mission can make all these measurements simultaneously; ideally to remove any 114 contextual temporal variability it should be done simultaneously both upstream and down-115 stream of the shock. 116

-4-

Current studies (Goodrich et al., 2022, private communication) are looking into de-117 signing a dedicated mission to attack the shock partition comprehensively. In order to 118 inform those considerations, we attempt here to exploit the high-quality, high-resolution 119 data from the Magnetospheric Multiscale Mission (MMS) (Burch et al., 2016) in order 120 to demonstrate what can, and cannot, currently be accomplished. MMS was designed 121 to study hot magnetospheric plasmas. The low density and cold nature of the solar wind 122 leads to some uncertainties and errors in determining the full set of parameters needed 123 for the partition problem. Some contributions of the different species, such as the heat-124 ing at low particle energies or the nature of accelerated beams or distribution tails, also 125 stretch signal-to-noise aspects due to a combination of background and counting statis-126 tics. Despite these limitations, we shall see that MMS can shed considerable light onto 127 the shock partition problem thanks to its comprehensive instrument suite and high time 128 resolution. 129

The next sections summarize the data and our primary analysis methods. We then present our results and provide some discussion before drawing our final Conclusions. An appendix quantifies the numerous sources of errors and uncertainties.

#### 133 **2 Data**

Our primary results are drawn from the Magnetospheric Multiscale mission (MMS) 134 (Burch et al., 2016). We also used data from the Wind (Harten & Clark, 1995; L. B. Wil-135 son et al., 2021) spacecraft to establish the prevailing interplanetary conditions. The main 136 analysis relies on MMS data from the Fast Plasma Investigation (FPI) (Pollock et al., 137 2016), Fluxgate Magnetometer (FGM) (Russell et al., 2016), electric field instrumenta-138 tion (Torbert et al., 2016; Ergun et al., 2016; Lindqvist et al., 2016) and Hot Particle Com-139 position Analyzer (HPCA)(Young et al., 2017). Where possible, we used moment sums 140 provided by the FPI team in the public L2 data files. When we subset the particle pop-141 ulations we calculate proton moments above 25 eV in the spacecraft frame to minimize 142 the impact of counting statistics at low energies. 143

We investigate in detail two crossings of the terrestrial bow shock by MMS to study the different energy fluxes incident on the shock and the resulting downstream partition of those fluxes. We also track those fluxes through the shock traversal as a first step in linking that partition to specific physical processes.

-5-

With even the state of the art instrumentation provided by MMS, we are forced to make some assumptions in order to compile a full set of energy fluxes. These are elaborated in the setup and discussion of each example. An appendix is devoted to an exploration of the sources and magnitudes of the errors and uncertainties across the suite of instruments employed in this work.

153

## 3 Mathematical framework

3.1 Moments of  $f(\mathbf{v})$ 

In order to assess the full partition it is necessary to establish the mathematical 155 framework for a multi-component plasma. To do this, we review the moment analysis 156 of the collisionless Vlasov equation for the velocity distribution function  $f(\mathbf{v})$  of each species 157 j (Boyd & Sanderson, 2003; Schwartz, 1998; Paschmann & Daly, 2008; Schwartz & Marsch, 158 1983). For convenience, we omit the species label i unless we need to refer to a specific 159 species. We use "species" here in a generalized way, since it is often convenient to sep-160 arate the protons, for example, into different sub-populations, such as the core solar wind, 161 shock-reflected ions, and diffuse energetic ions. We treat each of these populations as a 162 separate species. Note that since protons can be exchanged amongst these different sub-163 populations, the continuity equation expressing conservation of protons applies only to 164 their aggregate, not to each sub-population. 165

166

The velocity-space average of any quantity  $A(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t)$  is given by

$$\langle A \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{n} \int A f(\mathbf{v}) \, d^3 v \tag{1}$$

where *n* is the number density of the species whose phase space density is  $f(\mathbf{v})$ . The integration is performed over the full region of velocity space with non-negligible  $f(\mathbf{v})$ . In some cases the moments might be truncated by the range of a particle instrument; if a significant portion of the particle population extends outside that range, the analysis becomes incomplete. Sometimes, we also purposely confine the integration to specific velocity space regions to separate contributions from different sub-populations.

We define **U** as a convenient reference velocity common to all species. In some contexts this might be the total center of mass velocity, or the velocity of one of the plasma constituents. We then translate the velocity-space variable **v** to a new variable **w** via

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{w} \tag{2}$$

with the peculiar velocity w defined such that  $\langle \mathbf{w} \rangle \equiv \mathbf{0}$ . For each species, the veloc-176 ity **u** (subscript j omitted for brevity) is the species' bulk velocity relative to the refer-177 ence velocity U. We note here that while U is common to all species, many have rela-178 tive drifts with respect to one another, so their  $\mathbf{u}_j$ 's will be different. Such differential 179 drifts can be an important part of the energy associated with that species (Schwartz & 180 Marsch, 1983; Goldman et al., 2020, 2021). Unless the differential streaming between species 181 needs to be studied explicitly, the overall energetics only involve the species' total bulk 182 velocity  $\mathbf{u}' \equiv \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{u}$ . 183

The framework below can be applied in any frame in which the shock is at rest, to meet the temporal stationarity requirement. For the shock application, we choose to evaluate energy fluxes in the Normal Incidence Frame (NIF), in which the upstream (solar wind proton) flow is along the shock normal. Velocities measured in the spacecraft frame are transformed to the NIF frame by subtracting the velocity

$$\mathbf{V}^{SC2NIF} = V_n^{sh} \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{V}^{up,SC} - \mathbf{n} \left( \mathbf{V}^{up,SC} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right)$$
(3)

where  $V_n^{sh}$  is the signed shock velocity along the shock normal **n**, and  $\mathbf{V}^{up,SC}$  is the incident bulk flow velocity in the spacecraft frame, which we take to be the solar wind proton velocity (see Figure 1c and Equation 5 in Schwartz et al. (2021)). Then **u'** will be the species' bulk velocity measured in the NIF frame.

193

Table 1. Moment definitions

With this decomposition, we define in Table 1 the fluid-like quantities for each species.

Symbol	Definition	Name
n	$\int f(\mathbf{v})  d^3 v$	number density
ρ	nm	mass density
u	$\langle {f v}  angle - {f U}$	Relative bulk velocity
$\underline{\mathbf{p}}$	$ ho\left<\mathbf{ww} ight>$	Pressure tensor
p	$\frac{1}{3}\rho\left\langle w^{2}\right\rangle \equiv\frac{1}{3}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\underline{\mathbf{p}}}$	Scalar pressure
$\mathbf{q}$	$rac{1}{2} ho\left\langle \mathbf{w}w^{2} ight angle$	Heat flux
$\mathbf{Q}$	$\rho\left<\mathbf{v}\frac{1}{2}v^2\right>$	Total energy flux

#### <sup>194</sup> **3.2 Energy fluxes**

It is straightforward to now write the total species energy flux  $\mathbf{Q}$  in terms of the moments of  $f(\mathbf{v})$  as

$$\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{q} + \tag{4}$$

$$+\underline{\underline{\mathbf{p}}}\cdot\mathbf{u}' + \frac{3}{2}p\mathbf{u}' + \tag{5}$$

$$+\mathbf{u}'\frac{1}{2}\rho u'^2\tag{6}$$

The combination of the two terms in (5) defines the enthalpy flux  $\mathbf{F}_{enth}$  while (6) is the bulk flow or ram energy flux  $\mathbf{F}_{ram}$ . Note that for a species that contains two distinct sub-populations, for example, contributions of different terms in (4), (5) and (6) will be different if the sub-populations are considered separately or only the moments of the parent species are considered. However, the total energy flux is the same.

The enthalpy flux can be expanded to reveal the contributions of, e.g., parallel and perpendicular pressures by decomposing the pressure tensor  $\mathbf{p}$  as

$$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{p}}} \equiv p_{\parallel} \hat{\mathbf{b}} \hat{\mathbf{b}} + p_{\perp} \left( \underline{\underline{\mathbf{I}}} - \hat{\mathbf{b}} \hat{\mathbf{b}} \right) + \underline{\underline{\mathbf{p}}}^{\dagger}$$
(7)

which identifies the scalar parallel (perpendicular) pressure  $p_{\parallel}$   $(p_{\perp})$  with

$$p_{\parallel} \equiv \hat{\mathbf{b}}^T \cdot \underline{\underline{\mathbf{p}}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}$$
(8)

$$p_{\perp} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( tr \mathbf{\underline{p}} - p_{\parallel} \right) \tag{9}$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$  is a unit (column) vector in the direction of the local magnetic field. The traceless tensor  $\underline{\mathbf{p}}^{\dagger}$  ensures completeness and is found by re-arranging (7) once  $p_{\parallel}$  and  $p_{\perp}$  are determined from (8) and (9). It embodies the influence of agyrotropy and any other effects on the structure of the full pressure tensor (Swisdak, 2016). Substituting this expression for  $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$  into (5) yields

$$\mathbf{F}_{enth} = p_{\parallel} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}' + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \left( \hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \mathbf{u}' \right) \end{bmatrix} +$$
(10)

$$+p_{\perp}\left[2\mathbf{u}'-\hat{\mathbf{b}}\left(\hat{\mathbf{b}}\cdot\mathbf{u}'\right)\right]+\tag{11}$$

$$+\underline{\underline{\mathbf{p}}}^{\dagger}\cdot\mathbf{u}'$$
(12)

Interestingly, under nearly perpendicular geometries  $\mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \mathbf{u}'$  is small and the perpendic-

- ular pressure is weighted by a factor of 4 relative to the parallel contribution to the to-
- tal enthalpy flux.

To the particle kinetic energy fluxes we add the electromagnetic Poynting flux  $\mathbf{E} \times$ **B**/ $\mu_o$ . Steady-state energy conservation requires that the total energy flux **F** along the shock normal be constant, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{n} \equiv \mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}}{\mu_o} + \sum_{\text{species}} \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \text{constant}$$
(13)

For shocks which exhibit non-stationary or spatial structure it may be useful to fur-216 ther expand all quantities in terms of spatio-temporal average and fluctuating contribu-217 tions. This expansion applies also to the shock normal  $\mathbf{n}$  in the case of rippled or reform-218 ing shocks (Lowe & Burgess, 2003; Johlander et al., 2018; Madanian, Desai, et al., 2021). 219 Under such circumstances,  $\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{n}$  need no longer be constant, due to the localized or tem-220 poral build up/depletion of energy density. Nonetheless, it is instructive to explore the 221 various contributions to the energy flux, suitably averaged to minimize the impact of vari-222 ations in  $\mathbf{n}$  or other spatial/temporal variations (see Zank et al. (2021) for a partial re-223 laxation of these restrictions). 224

225

#### 3.3 Including fluctuations

Most real shocks, especially quasi-parallel shocks, are associated with significant fluctuations in plasma and field parameters. It is natural to ask if the formalism presented above can be extended to evaluate the contributions of such fluctuations to the energy budget. This question can be shown to have a non-unique answer in moving, inhomogeneous flows (Dewar, 1970) that stems from the fact that the terms in, e.g., (6) and (13) are all nonlinear. For example, separating the fields into mean and fluctuating components  $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_o + \delta \mathbf{E}$  yields a Poynting flux (omitting the  $\mu_o$  divisor)

$$\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{E}_o \times \mathbf{B}_o + \delta \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}_o + \mathbf{E}_o \times \delta \mathbf{B} + \delta \mathbf{E} \times \delta \mathbf{B}$$
(14)

If  $\mathbf{E}_o$  and  $\mathbf{B}_o$  are true averages, the middle two terms will average to zero to leave

$$\langle \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B} \rangle = \mathbf{E}_o \times \mathbf{B}_o + \langle \delta \mathbf{E} \times \delta \mathbf{B} \rangle \tag{15}$$

For simple waves in homogeneous plasmas this approach separates the Poynting flux into contributions from mean and fluctuating fields. We note here that the term with fluctuations actually contributes to the overall plasma  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$  drift which, if significant, needs to be considered carefully lest it be double counted in the other convected energy flux terms. This is analogous to the Stokes' drift arising from acoustic waves in fluids (Dewar,
1970).

In non-steady inhomogeneous media, the mean fields may vary slowly depending on whether the averaging is done spatially, temporally or some other way. In these cases, the middle terms in (14) will not necessarily average to zero. There is also no guarantee that the averaging procedure will result in a constant average Poynting flux on the left hand side of (15).

Such an approach can be similarly applied to the various terms in the particle energy flux. Some of those possess nonlinearities higher than quadratic which pose further questions about how the individual parameter fluctuations might correlate with one another to leave non-zero averages, and whether those correlations will have constant averages.

Given these complexities, we look at the energy fluxes in two ways. Firstly, we de-250 termine mean parameter values, drawing on different data sources and assumptions. This 251 corresponds to the contributions of the mean fields in (14) and their particle counter-252 parts. Secondly, we calculate the full time series of all the energy flux terms using MMS 253 data. The results could be averaged, resulting in a determination of the left hand side 254 of (15) and its particle counterparts. The difference between such averaged and mean 255 field fluxes would be a systematic and robust way to characterize the contributions to 256 the energy budget that might be best attributed to the fluctuations. These concepts could 257 be extended to targeting a subset of the fluctuations by filtering the data, but this needs 258 to be done in a way that preserves the full bookkeeping of the energy fluxes. 259

260

## 4 Example 1: 2019-03-05 at 19:39

261

## 4.1 Average parameters

This shock crossing was analyzed in the detailed study of the electrostatic crossshock potential by Schwartz et al. (2021). Here we need a wider set of parameters measured on both sides of the shock. We have revisited all the datasets, and provide in Table 2 a summary of all the parameters needed to evaluate (13). The extensive footnotes to that table document the uncertainties, assumptions, and in some cases guesses forced on us due to the unavailability of definitive accurate parameter values.

Parameter	Upstream (up)	Downstream (dn)	Comments
MMS Times	19:43:57-19:44:47	19:34:49-19:36:53	up: MMS2; dn: MMS1
Wind Times	18:24:19-18:45:47		
MMS Position	$(10.1, -13.4, 6.9)^b$		Re
Shock normal	(0.847, -0.482, 0.226)		Slavin and Holzer (1981)
$V_n^{sh}$	-7.6		MMS2,1,4 timing
$\mathbf{V}^{SC2NIF}$	(-113, -150, 72)		km/s Eqn $(3)$
Shock geometry $\theta_{Bn}$	$76^{\circ}$		
${\rm Shock}~{\rm M}_A$	7.4		
Shock $M_{fast}$	5.6		
Upstream plasma $\beta_{i,e}$	0.54,0.41		
Magnetic field ${\bf B}$	$(3.45, 2.47, -2.46)^b$	(9.48, 9.9, -8.1)	nT; $\mathbf{B}_{up}$ MMS2
DC Electric Field <sup><math>c</math></sup>	(0.21,  0.98,  1.28)	(-0.46, 0.75, 1.46)	$\mathrm{mV/m}~(-\mathbf{u}_p'\times\mathbf{B})$
Proton density $n_p$	$5.3^d$	17.1	$\#/\mathrm{cm}^3$
Proton velocity $\mathbf{V}_p$	$(-402, 14, -5)^e$	(-198, -85, 65)	km/s s/c frame
p NIF velocity $\mathbf{u}_p'$	(-289, 164, -77)	(-85, 65, -7)	$\rm km/s$
		$\left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0.47 & -0.08 & 0.05 \end{array} \right)$	
Proton pressure $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{p}}}_p$	$0.0052^{f}$	-0.08 $0.36$ $0.04$	nPa
		$\left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0.05 & 0.04 & 0.48 \end{array} \right)$	
Proton heat flux $q_p$	$(0 , 0, 0)^g$	(1.1, 7.2, -3.25)	$\mu { m W/m^2}$
Alpha density $n_{\alpha}$	$0.024^{h}$	0.12	$\#/\mathrm{cm}^3$
Alpha velocity $\mathbf{V}_{\alpha}$	$(-426, 8.7, 8.4)^i$	(-145, -63, 59)	$\rm km/s~s/c$ frame
$\alpha$ NIF velocity $\mathbf{u}_{\alpha}'$	(-313, 159, -64)	(-32, 87, -13)	$\rm km/s$
		$\begin{pmatrix} 18 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	
Alpha pressure $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{p}}}_{\alpha}$	$0.06^{j}$	1 12 2	$10^{-3}$ nPa
		$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & 11 \end{array}\right)$	
Alpha heat flux $q_{\alpha}$	$(0, 0, 0)^g$	$(0, 0, 0)^g$	
Electron density $n_e$	$5.35^{k}$	16.7	$\#/\mathrm{cm}^3$
Electron velocity $\mathbf{V}_e$	$(-402.2, 14, -5)^l$	(-197, -84, 65)	$\rm km/s~s/c~frame$
e <sup>–</sup> NIF velocity $\mathbf{u}'_e$	(-289, 164, -77)	(-84, 66, -7)	$\rm km/s$

# Table 2: Parameters for ${\rm MMS}^a$ shock crossing on 2019-03-05 @ 19:39

Parameter	Upstream (up)	Downstream (dn)	Comments
Electron pressure $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_{e}$	$0.0038^{e}$	$\left(\begin{array}{cccc} 0.126 & -0.0001 & 0.0002 \\ -0.0001 & 0.126 & 10^{-5} \\ 0.0002 & 10^{-5} & 0.126 \end{array}\right)$	nPa
Electron heat flux $q_e$	(0, 0, 0)	(0.2,0.85,0.68)	$\mu { m W/m^2}$
Energy fluxes along shock	x normal in $\mu W/m^2$		
$\mathbf{F}_{ram,p}\cdot\mathbf{n}$	-175.4	-17.2	
$\mathbf{F}_{enth,p}\cdot\mathbf{n}$	-4.3	-121.9	
$\mathbf{q}_p\cdot\mathbf{n}$	0	-3.2	
$\mathbf{F}_{\mathrm{ram},lpha}\cdot\mathbf{n}$	-3.7	-0.3	
$\mathbf{F}_{\text{enth},\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{n}$	-0.05	-2.4	
$\mathbf{q}_{lpha}\cdot\mathbf{n}$	0	0	
$\mathbf{F}_{ram,e}\cdot\mathbf{n}$	-0.1	-0.01	
$\mathbf{F}_{enth,e}\cdot\mathbf{n}$	-3.2	-33.0	
$\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{e}}\cdot\mathbf{n}$	0	-0.09	
Poynting $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/\mu_o$	-6.2	-21.0	
Totals	-192.8	-199.1	

Table 2	: Parameters	for	$MMS^a$	shock	crossing o	n 201	9-03-05	0	19:39	(cont.)
		<b>TOT</b>	1111110	orro orr	or obbing o			~	±0.00	00110.

 $^{a}$  All downstream parameters from MMS1. Sources for most upstream parameters

ters as footnoted or in Comments column.

 $^{b}$  All vector and tensor components in GSE

<sup>c</sup> Assume DC  $\mathbf{E} = -\mathbf{u}'_p \times \mathbf{B}$ . Ignores Poynting flux carried by fluctuations

<sup>d</sup> Derived from  $n_p(dn)$  using measured  $\mathbf{u}'_p(up,dn)$  assuming conservation of normal proton number flux. This value is consistent with Wind WAVES density

deduced from upper hybrid resonance line.

 $^{e}$  Wind 3DP.

 $^{f}$  Wind SWE; isotropic contributions only.

 $^{g}$  Unavailable

 $^h$  Derived from  $n_\alpha({\rm dn})$  using measured  ${\bf u}'_\alpha({\rm up,dn})$  assuming conservation of

normal  $\alpha$  number flux.

 $^{i}$  Wind on board moment.

 $^j$ No data available. Assume mean  $T_\alpha/T_p\sim 2.5$  (L. B. Wilson III et al., 2018)

Table 2: Parameters f	for $MMS^a$	shock crossing o	n 2019-03-05 @	) 19:39 (	cont.)
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Parameter	Upstream (up)	Downstream (dn)	Comments
k Wind WAVES ex	xperiment upper hybrid line co	rresponds to $\sim 5 \mathrm{cm}^{-3}$ . Up-	
stream value here	ensures charge neutrality Dow	nstream value is actual MMS1	1

measured, and is close to neutrality.

<sup>*l*</sup> Derived from protons and alphas to ensure zero electric current.

The partition amongst the average upstream and downstream energy fluxes given 268 in Table 2 are shown in Figure 1. Despite the assumptions, estimations and uncertain-269 ties of the average parameters given in Table 2 the total upstream and downstream en-270 ergy fluxes agree to within 3%. Certainly this level of agreement is fortuitous rather than 271 a testament to the robustness of the accuracy of any parameter value. Determining the 272 "best" lag time from Wind to the bow shock depends either on assumptions about con-273 vection speeds and orientation of structures or cross-correlating some feature in, say, the 274 magnetic field direction with in our case the MMS spacecraft upstream of the bow shock. 275 For example, over the averaging interval used for the Wind solar wind data, the proton 276 density varies from 4.0 to 5.0 particles/cm<sup>3</sup>. Here, we chose to rely instead on mass con-277 servation calculated form the downstream mass flux and solar wind velocity. This cal-278 culation agrees with the density deduced directly from the plasma upper hybrid line at 279 Wind, which was 5.3 particles/ $cm^3$ . This spread in density estimates of 20% or more re-280 flects the expected uncertainty in the primary ram energy. We also used MMS2, the most 281 upstream spacecraft, to measure the upstream magnetic field as the field direction varies 282 considerably over the distance from Wind at L1 to the bow shock. 283

Not surprisingly, the upstream energy flux is dominated by the proton ram energy, 284 especially in this case of relatively low  $\alpha$  particle density  $n_{\alpha} \sim 0.5\% n_p$ . For  $\alpha$  parti-285 cle densities of a few % their ram energy might contribute 10% of the total energy flux. 286 That proton ram energy is converted primarily into the proton enthaply flux observed 287 downstream. Apart from the remnant proton ram energy, the remainder of the energy 288 budget is consumed by the electron enthalpy flux and a significant DC Poynting flux. 289 Recall that these average values use  $\mathbf{E} = -\langle \mathbf{u}'_p \rangle \times \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle$  and thus do not include wave 290 or turbulent fluctuations. 291



Figure 1. Partition of energy fluxes upstream (left) and downstream (right) of the shock crossing on 2019-03-05 derived using the parameter values in Table 2. The total observed energy flux is  $-193 \,\mu W/m^2$  upstream and  $-199 \,\mu W/m^2$  downstream.

#### 292

### 4.2 Instantaneous energy fluxes

In addition to evaluating (13) using basic upstream and downstream average parameter values, we also explore the instantaneous energy fluxes making use of the MMS instrument suite. We have not attempted to force the MMS data to match the parameters given in Table 2 which relied on other spacecraft, mass conservation, and other considerations. By following different energy fluxes through the shock, the time series approach provides insight to the processes responsible for the energy (re)partition.

An overview of this shock and the basic energy fluxes is given in Figure 2. As expected, the proton ram energy dominates the upstream (latter half). In the downstream, the proton enthalpy flux is the largest single contribution to the total energy flux, while the electron enthalpy and Poynting fluxes contribute the rest in roughly equal measure. The upstream oscillations are largely the consequence of the solar wind beam moving across pixels in the FPI instrument. Downstream fluctuations may be real but may also be limited by instrumental characteristics. The Poynting flux reaches large values with significant positive and negative excursions within the shock overshoot region just af ter 19:39.

The dashed horizontal line in Figure 2e shows the energy flux based on the aver-308 age parameters in Table 2 against the instantaneous total (cyan) that is derived with-309 out further correction or assumption from the MMS data. The two approaches appear 310 to agree although the data is subject to large fluctuations. Some of these fluctuations, 311 such as the large variability in upstream ion density, are the result of the instrumental 312 inability to resolve the cold solar wind beam. As we shall see below, some may also be 313 the result of counting statistics of the suprathermal particles. Some of the fluctuations 314 are undoubtedly real and show the influence of turbulence and nonstationarity. 315

The time series reveal several interesting features. The proton enthalpy flux (red 316 in panel (e)) rises in the shock foot region upstream of the shock ramp. This is due to 317 the presence of reflected protons that effectively broaden the proton distribution there. 318 The rise in proton enthalpy is balanced to some extent by the oppositely-signed proton 319 heat flux (dark green panels (e) and (f)) that is linked to the counter-streaming reflected 320 protons. Within the shock overshoot region there is a systematic decrease in the pro-321 ton enthalpy flux (panel (e); see also panel (h)) that is compensated by a rise in proton 322 heat flux (panels (e) and (f). At the kinetic level, the tight mutual gyration of transmit-323 ted and returning reflected protons results in a proton distribution that is complex and 324 fragmented, resulting in significant anisotropies (discussed below) and distortions. If we 325 treat all the protons as a single species, a significant fraction of the proton energy flux 326 within the shock foot, ramp and overshoot is carried as heat flux. It is possible to re-327 gard the protons as having multi-components (Goldman et al., 2020) which would re-328 distribute part of the heat flux to ram or enthaply fluxes of those components. Such a 329 representation does not, of course, change the overall energy flux but it does serve to re-330 veal the physical mechanisms at work that are masked by the moments from the full, 331 single proton population. These aspects are particularly relevant to collisionless shocks 332 which generate complex, fragmented velocity space particle populations. 333

Figure 2f confirms the relative importance of the electron enthalpy and Poynting fluxes in the downstream region. Note here that the time series Poynting flux uses instantaneous direct measurements of the DC electric field transformed to the NIF frame and magnetic field, and thus captures all the contributions up to the sampling frequency



Figure 2. Overview of the quasi-perpendicular shock crossing on 2019/03/05 as observed by MMS 1. From top to bottom: (a) ion omnidirectional phase space density (b) magnetic field. The shaded region denotes the interval used to determine downstream average parameters. See Table 2 for the 20 min averaging interval applied to the Wind data (not shown) (c) electron and ion (assumed proton) density. The shaded intervals divide the crossing into upstream and regions to which we have applied separate ion "core" and suprathermal masks in later more detailed analysis. (d) ion velocity (e) normal component of the ram and enthalpy fluxes of the protons, alpha particles, and electrons together with the proton and electron heat fluxes and the Poynting flux. The dashed black line corresponds to the average up and downstream total energy flux derived from the parameters in Table 2 while the cyan curve shows the sum of the individual MMS 1 contributions to the instantaneous energy flux. (f) Detail of the fluxes in (e) but omitting the dominant proton ram and enthalpy energy fluxes. (g) decomposition of the proton pressure tensor as computed by us over "All" angles into parallel  $(p_{\parallel}),$  perpendicular  $(p_{\perp})$  and remainder ( $\underline{\mathbf{p}}^{\dagger}$ , summed over all elements). (h) Contributions of the decomposed pressure tensor to the proton enthalpy flux as prescribed by (10)-(12) together with their sum and the un-decomposed -16total (magenta) based on L2 data files shown in (e).

of the DC magnetometer, namely 128 Hz. This is in contrast to the DC Poynting flux 338 shown in Table 2 which shows only the averaged DC flux assuming a frozen in electric 339 field. The electron heat flux (olive green in panels (e) and (f)) is highly variable. This 340 is probably the result of low count rates in the wings of the electron distribution which 341 dominate the third moment of the electron distribution. It is worth recalling that the 342 solar wind flow is sub-thermal for the electrons, so their distribution is quite broad with 343 only marginal shift due to the bulk motion. Thus, although the electron ram energy is 344 small, the electron enthaply flux plays a significant role downstream. 345

346

#### 4.3 Anisotropies

Under quasi-perpendicular geometry the primary energy conversion process at su-347 percritical shocks involves a sub-population of incident protons. This subpopulation is 348 near-specularly reflected at the shock ramp and gyrates upstream before crossing into 349 the downstream region where it forms partial ring features in velocity space (Woods, 1969; 350 Paschmann et al., 1982). This spread in velocities is thus primarily perpendicular to the 351 magnetic field. As Figure 2g shows, the perpendicular pressure dominates the downstream 352 region while in the immediate vicinity of the shock ramp the reflected ions are highly 353 agyrotropic; their influence is seen in the large  $\underline{\mathbf{p}}^{\dagger}$  deviations from the simple  $p_{\parallel}, p_{\perp}$  parts 354 of the pressure tensor in (7). 355

There is a very systematic increase in  $p_{\parallel}$  from the shock ramp into the downstream 356 region seen in the red trace of Figure 2g. This increase in  $p_{\parallel}$  suggests that the protons 357 relax toward isotropy. However, the parallel contribution to the proton enthalpy flux in 358 Figure 2h remains small throughout, as anticipated in the discussion of (10)–(12) above. 359 The agyrotropic pressure is indicated by the blue trace in Figure 2g which shows a sim-360 ple algebraic sum of its components; the sign of this sum is not necessarily significant. 361 Panel (h) shows that near the shock ramp and foot the agyrotropic pressure contributes 362 an enthalpy flux of opposite sign to that of the total enthalpy flux. This is perhaps not 363 surprising as it is related to the reflected protons which return to the region upstream 364 of the main shock ramp. 365



Figure 3. Details of the ion distributions and their contributions to the energy fluxes. (A) magnetic field in shock lmn coordinates. (B)-(D) ion distributions transformed to the shock normal coordinates and reduced to 1D distributions along the n, m, and l directions respectively. (E),(F) 1s averaged 2D cuts of ion distributions summed onto the nl, nm planes at the times indicated by the vertical lines in (A)-(D). (G) angle-angle and (H) energy-angle reductions of ion distributions downstream, within the overshoot and ramp, and upstream. The black (magenta) boxes isolate the core sub-region in phase space to separate that core from the suprathermals in the downstream (upstream) regions as shaded in Figure 2c. Both sets are shown in Ramp plot to emphasize their relative positions. (I) DC magnetic field (J) energy fluxes along the shock normal for the separate core and non-core ions together with the Poynting flux and (negligibly small)  $\alpha$  particle energy fluxes. (K) detail of (J) omitting the upstream ram and downstream noncore enthalpy fluxes.

366

#### 4.4 Sub-population analysis

The influence of agyrotropy and suprathermal reflected ions suggest that deeper 367 analysis of the ion velocity space distributions and isolation of sub-populations may shed 368 further light on the partition problem. Figure 3 illustrates several analysis strands. Pan-369 els (B)–(D) show reduced velocity-time spectrograms after transforming to the NIF frame 370 and rotating into shock normal coordinates. Here n is the upstream-directed normal com-371 ponent, the upstream magnetic field lies in the nl plane with  $B_l > 0$  and m completes 372 the right-handed system. In addition to the incident solar wind beam at  $V_n < 0$  seen 373 continuously after ~19:40, the reflected ions  $(V_n > 0)$  are visible upstream of the shock 374 ramp in panel B, and also in the  $V_m$  spectrograms (panel D) both upstream and down-375 stream. 376

The reflected ions are seen in the snapshots of the 2D reduced distributions in (E), 377 (F). In (F)f, for example, they appear as the extended arc above and right of the small 378 intense solar wind beam. These reflected ions remain distinct even downstream of the 379 shock and evolve from the simple velocity space portraits in, e.g., (E)f, (F)f. The ion dis-380 tributions within the overshoot region, marked (d) in (A)-(F) are noticeably less dispersed 381 in velocity space with a depletion at suprathermal velocities relative to the distributions 382 further downstream. We note here that while the spatial size of a gyro-orbit will decrease 383 in a strong  $|\mathbf{B}|$  region, its velocity should not. The overshoot region is unusual in that 384 no one or two energy fluxes dominate here. This region also appears to be a barrier to 385 the downstream suprathermal protons as the region outside the core box is populated 386 downstream (leftmost panel in (H)) over a range of both angles and energies, but not 387 significantly so at the overshoot nor further upstream. 388

To explore the relative energy flux contributions of the core protons and reflected 389 or suprathermal protons we have isolated the core population in velocity space by the 390 central delineated region in Figure 3G,H. This core embodies the primary thermal pro-301 tons. The "noncore" population of suprathermal or otherwise nonthermal protons oc-392 cupy the remainder of velocity space outside the central core region. The full instrument 303 angular and energy range is shown in these panels, with  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  being the instrument 394 polar and azimuthal look angles (close to GSE). We employ simple instrumental masks 395 for this purpose, using different masks downstream (black) and upstream (magenta) cor-396 responding to the regions shown in Figure 2c. We then treat these as two sub-populations 397

and calculate their moments and resulting contributions to the terms in (13) which are shown in panels J and K. Note the absence of significant phase space density at the highest energies, obviating the need to consider more energetic particles for this example.

In the downstream region, and in the shock foot, the proton enthalpy flux is car-401 ried primarily by the noncore protons (blue trace). Downstream the noncore protons are 402  $\sim 18\%$  of the total population and carry 60% of the proton enthalpy flux, or 40% of the 403 total energy flux. Panel K omits non-core flux downstream to uncover the core proton 404 enthalpy flux (red) which is roughly half as large. The residual intrinsic heat flux of the 405 noncore component (purple) is highly variable but on average is  $\sim 75\%$  of the downstream 406 core ram energy flux (black), indicating that the noncore protons contribute this addi-407 tional energy flux to the downstream energy budget. 408

#### <sup>409</sup> 5 Example 2: 2019-02-15 at 10:22

We have similarly analyzed another example drawn from the season in which the 410 MMS spacecraft were strung out in a colinear configuration with total separation  $\sim 700$  km. 411 In this case, the shock motion was less steady but moving sunward at a speed of  $\sim$ 54 km/s 412 based on the average of speeds deduced from the successive ramp crossings by the 4 space-413 craft. The upstream plasma  $\beta$  's were  $\beta_{i,e}=0.55, 0.77,$  only slightly higher than the first 414 example. The Alfvén and fast Mach numbers were also slightly higher at 8.9 and 6.1 re-415 spectively. The shock was very nearly perpendicular ( $\theta_{Bn} = 93^{\circ}$ ). One significant dif-416 ference is that the solar wind  $\alpha$ -particle density at 1.7% that of the protons was closer 417 to average solar wind values. 418

An overview of this shock, and the resulting energy fluxes, is shown in Figure 4 in 419 the same format as Figure 2. Panels (i) and (j) show the energy partition at this shock 420 deduced from average values upstream and downstream as shaded in (b) and supplemented 421 by more accurate solar wind parameters from Wind and tweaked to ensure mass con-422 servation. In this case, similar assumptions to those footnoted in Table 2 yield an av-423 erage total energy flux of  $309 \,\mu W/m^2$  which agree to within 3% from upstream to down-424 stream. The energy flux is 50% larger in this case, due to a combination of the faster and 425 outward shock speed, a higher solar wind velocity (460 km/s), larger plasma  $\beta$  and higher 426  $\alpha$ -particle density. Here the  $\alpha$  ram energy contributes 6% of the total upstream energy 427 flux. 428

-20-

This example also shows the role played by proton agyrotropies and anisotropies within the overshoot and downstream. The distorted proton distributions in the shock ramp and overshoot manifest themselves in significant contributions from the proton heat flux and  $\underline{\mathbf{p}}^{\dagger}$  within those regions of the shock transition. Downstream the perpendicular enthalpy flux dominates despite the similar parallel and perpendicular pressures. With higher energy fluxes and plasma  $\beta$ , it becomes harder to separate systematically core vs. non-core proton distributions downstream of the shock.

#### 436 6 Instrumental considerations

The analysis presented here makes strong demands on the resolution of the instru-437 mentation. We have already mentioned the MMS FPI design constraints which prevent 438 it from fully resolving the cold solar wind ions (see also Cara et al., 2017; De Keyser et 439 al., 2018; De Marco et al., 2016). This constraint is illustrated by the small number of 440 pixels within the core mask shown in the rightmost plots of Figure 3G.H. Virtually all 441 the nonzero pixels outside that mask in the far upstream region correspond to a single 442 count. Note that these occur over all energies due to a combination of low phase space 443 density and background sources. The omni-directional phase space distribution in Fig-444 ure 2 illustrates the problem at low energies where in the upstream region the phase space 445 density should be very low. The noise floor also impinges at high energies, well-above 446 the solar wind beam. 447

Although uncertainties due to counting statistics are quantified (Gershman et al., 2015), they lead to low signal-to-noise ratio in the data. For our own moment calculations we remove bins below 25 eV in the spacecraft frame to minimize the impact on the energy fluxes. The same issues are also probably responsible for the broad low-level background seen in the reduced ion distributions (e.g., Figure 3E,F) for which we did not attempt to remove low signal-to-noise bins.

FPI electron measurements can become starved for counts at the lowest energies, where careful removal of photo- and secondary electrons is required along with adjustment for the spacecraft potential. Errors and uncertainties in these pre-processing procedures propagate in particular to the low order electron moments, i.e., the density and velocity. At high energies where phase space densities are low, electron count rates can also be small. Since high energies contribute disproportionately to higher particle mo-



**Figure 4.** (a)-(h)As in Figure 2 but for the nearly perpendicular shock crossing at 10:22 on 2019-02-15 except (a) plots differential energy flux. Shaded regions in (b) were used to compute some average upstream and downstream parameters (i)-(j) Energy partition pie charts.

ments, errors and noise here impact directly the determination of the electron energy fluxes.
For example, in our case studies, the electron intrinsic heat fluxes are highly variable.
Improving the signal-to-noise at high energies, for both electrons and ions, within a single detector would involve increasing the dynamic range to cope with the disparate characteristics of the solar wind and magnetosheath plasmas.

In addition to these counting and background matters, the FPI instrument employs 465 a deflector system to enable a full  $2\pi$  range of azimuthal directions to be sampled within 466 the instrument's 150 ms ion sample period. The sequence of deflector sweeps competes 467 with the spacecraft spin to generate instrumental periodities of  $\sim 0.5-2.5$  s (Barrie et 468 al., 2021). Combined with the coarse sampling grid, the energy-angle sampling pattern 469 catches a varying part of the solar wind peak resulting in the large fluctuations seen in 470 the density there. Additionally, some of the variability of the downstream energy fluxes 471 calculated here may contain remnants of this instrumental characteristic particularly when 472 looking at details of sub-populations or anisotropies. 473

We have utilized  $\alpha$ -particle measurements from MMC HPCA. This instrument also 474 has difficulty resolving the cold solar wind beam upstream of the shock, compounded by 475 low count rates there. The  $\alpha$ 's carry a substantial energy flux in the solar wind. Through 476 the shock layer where fields are tuned to process the primary influx of protons, they be-477 have differently due to their higher mass to charge ratio (Burgess, 1989; Fuselier et al., 478 1988; Trattner & Scholer, 1993; Gedalin, 2017; Madanian, Schwartz, et al., 2021). An-479 alyzing the evolution of anisotropies and sub-populations through the shock ramp will 480 require next generation composition instrumentation capable of coming closer to the ca-481 dence of proton measurements. 482

#### 483 7 Conclusions

The physics of collisionless shocks results in a partition of the incident energy that has not been systematically assessed to date. It has implications not only for determining the primary heating of, e.g., protons and electrons, but also for generating turbulence, accelerating sub-populations of particles, and influencing the minor species. Here we have laid out systematically the formalism to undertake this task. We began here with the simplest examples, namely reasonably steady moderate Mach number terrestrial bow shocks observed with the comprehensive state-of-the-art instrumentation onboard the MMS space-

-23-

craft. We also selected two quasi-perpendicular or perpendicular shocks. These are the
 most familiar, the most studied and simulated and also, thanks to the order imposed by
 the dominant magnetic field component tangential to the shock surface, the cleanest ex amples of collisionless shocks.

The application of the formalism is not without its difficulties. Most of these, in 495 the present examples, can be traced to limitations in instrument suites not designed to 496 simultaneously resolve the cold super-thermal solar wind proton beam and the hot shocked 497 magnetosheath ions. Both ion and electron measurements can be compromised by low 498 densities and contamination. Low count rates at low energies, due to the standard energy-499 dependent response, and at high energies, due to low phase space densities, require care 500 to recover accurately the full set of plasma moments up to and including particle heat 501 fluxes. Lower cadence and signal-to-noise for the composition instrumentation adds un-502 certainty in quantifying the input and response of minor species, of which the solar wind 503  $\alpha$ -particles represent significant energy carriers. 504

The Poynting flux is an important energy carrier. While we have not highlighted its measurement, calibrating magnetic and especially 3D electric field instruments from DC to kinetic frequencies requires the level of care and sophistication adopted by the MMS FIELDS team. Here the unequal length of spin-plane and axial electric antennae poses one of several obstacles to be overcome.

We have focused on expanding the particle energy flux into component ram, enthalpy, and intrinsic heat flux contributions. Those can be cast in different ways, including sub-dividing the particle populations into core and non-core elements, and decomposing the full pressure tensor into components parallel and perpendicular to the local magnetic field, together with a remnant tensor that holds information on shears, agyrotropies and other aspects that cannot be captured in the simple parallel-perpendicular paradigm.

We have performed two complementary analyses. To characterize the top-level energy partition, we have identified parameter values representative of the undisturbed region ahead of the shock and the downstream shocked plasma, on the assumption that both the shock and the solar wind conditions remain steady throughout. We exploited an MMS campaign in which the 4 spacecraft were stretched along a line, and hence roughly along the shock normal given the MMS high apogee elliptical orbit, to aid in selecting

-24-

#### manuscript submitted to Journal of Geophysical Research

such cases. We filled in gaps or uncertainties in MMS data by comparing it to data from the Wind spacecraft far upstream. Such comparisons are often made, but not without adding uncertainty both due to the long (60 mins) advection time and to the different instruments operated by the two missions. In some cases we substituted average values for inaccessible parameters, assumed mass conservation across the shock to estimate the poorly-determined solar wind density, and other educated-guess determinations as described in the extensive footnotes to Table 2.

As an alternative, and to probe the microphysics responsible for the energy par-530 tition, we calculated instantaneous values of all the contributing energy fluxes from up-531 stream through the shock transition to downstream. For this purpose, we drew uniquely 532 from the level 2 science quality data available in the public MMS archives. Surprisingly, 533 the total energy flux deduced this way agrees to that in the top-level average approach 534 to within 3%. We regard this agreement as fortuitous rather than definitive. This time 535 series analysis reveals large fluctuations in most, if not all, parameters and fluxes. While 536 some of these fluctuations are real, some can certainly be traced to the instrument lim-537 itations discussed above. 538

Although we have concentrated on illustrating the concepts via two relatively simple examples, we can already draw some conclusions about the energy partition at quasiperpendicular shocks. Some of these were previously known or suspected but others less so. These include:

1. The perpendicular proton pressure dominates the proton enthalpy flux even if the 543 parallel pressure is nearly the same. 544 2. In the shock foot, ramp and overshoot regions the proton energy flux includes con-545 tributions from non-gyrotropic elements of the pressure tensor ( $\mathbf{p}^{\dagger}$  in our termi-546 nology) and from the intrinsic proton heat flux. These contributions are traced 547 to the multiple proton sub-populations of transmitted and reflected ions. 548 3. In the downstream region, the main core protons comprise over 80% of the pop-549 ulation but carry only 40% of the proton enthalpy flux. The noncore, i.e. suprather-550 mal, protons are responsible for over 40% of the total energy flux even farther down-551

552 stream.

- 4. The total downstream proton enthalpy flux carries over 60% of the downstream energy flux, followed by the electron enthalpy flux at 12–17% depending on the presence of a significant  $\alpha$ -particle population.
- 556 5. In our example with significant  $\alpha$ 's (1.7% by number), their ram energy flux is 6% 557 of the total upstream energy budget while their downstream enthalpy flux is 5% 558 of the total. The  $\alpha$ 's are the second highest element of the incident energy in this 559 case. Their contribution would scale linearly under more extreme  $\alpha$ -rich condi-560 tions.
- 561 562

6. The downstream region exhibits large quasi-periodic fluctuations in total energy flux even under these relatively stable conditions.

The same framework is useful for studying the energy partition at quasi-parallel 563 shocks. Such shocks present at least two new aspects. Firstly, they are known to be in-564 herently time-dependent, with large amplitude fluctuations in both fields and particle 565 quantities extending from the foreshock region well into the downstream. It is possible, 566 of course, to apply the same full time series analysis we performed in the present work 567 to quasi-parallel shocks, but attempting to separate the contributions of fluctuations vs. 568 quasi-steady parameters will require some care (see Section 3.3 above). Additionally, and 569 importantly, quasi-parallel shocks are known particle accelerators. The energy carried 570 away by energetic particles and its dependence on shock parameters is an important as-571 pect of collisionless shock physics (David et al., 2022). Thus while in the present study 572 we have neglected energetic particles, they could and will need to be included within the 573 same framework when applied to quasi-parallel shocks. 574

While progress can be made with data from existing space assets, this work has 575 also highlighted current limitations. Foremost amongst these is the need to fully resolve 576 the incident cold solar wind proton beam, and to be able to similarly measure the most 577 important minor ions, especially the  $\alpha$ -particles. Such measurements will need to be well-578 matched to full  $4\pi$  coverage of the heated downstream populations. The ion distribu-579 tions at and downstream of the shock are highly fragmented which places demands on 580 both the temporal and angular/energy resolution required to capture the underlying physics 581 correctly. We have also seen here the importance of suprathermal wings of both ion and 582 electron distributions, with corresponding requirements to improve count rates in those 583 regions of phase space. Finally, simultaneous measurements upstream and downstream 584

-26-

would facilitate shock studies under more variable interplanetary conditions. Some stud-585 ies may be made possible by larger separations of the MMS spacecraft. We look forward 586 to the eventual selection of a mission such as MAKOS (Multi-point Assessment of the 587 Kinematics of Shocks) that can overcome present limitations. 588

#### Acknowledgments 589

590

- Wind data were drawn from the SPDF/CDAWEB repository (https://cdaweb.gsfc .nasa.gov/index.html/). We gratefully acknowledge the respective instrument teams 591 and archive curators. MMS data can be found at the MMS public Science Data Cen-592
- ter (https://lasp.colorado.edu/mms/sdc/public/). Data analysis and graphics were 593
- performed using the opensource QSAS Science Analysis System (https://sourceforge 594
- .net/projects/qsas/). Some of the work was supported by the International Space Sci-595
- ence Institute's (ISSI) International Teams programme ("Resolving the Microphysics of 596
- Collisionless Shock Waves" led by L.B. Wilson III) and the Geospace Environment Mod-597
- eling (GEM) Focus Group "Particle Heating and Thermalization in Collisionless Shocks 598
- in the MMS Era" led by L.B. Wilson III. This work was supported by NASA Awards 599
- 80NSSC19K0849 and 80NSSC20K0688 together with NASA MMS contracts to the in-600

strument teams. 601

#### References 602

- Amano, T., Katou, T., Kitamura, N., Oka, M., Matsumoto, Y., Hoshino, M., ... 603 Blake, J. B. (2020, February). Observational Evidence for Stochastic Shock 604 Drift Acceleration of Electrons at the Earth's Bow Shock. Phys. Rev. Lett., 605 124(6), 065101. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.065101 606
- Barrie, A. C., Schiff, C., Gershman, D. J., Giles, B. L., & Rand, D. (2021, July). 607 Calibrating Electrostatic Deflection of Charged Particle Sensors Using 608 Ambient Plasma Measurements. J. Geophys. Res., 126(7), e29149. doi: 609 10.1029/2021JA029149 610
- Boyd, T. J. M., & Sanderson, J. J. (2003). The physics of plasmas. doi: 10.1017/ 611 cbo9780511755750 612
- Burch, J. L., Moore, T. E., Torbert, R. B., & Giles, B. L. (2016, March). Magne-613 tospheric Multiscale Overview and Science Objectives. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 5-614 21. doi: 10.1007/s11214-015-0164-9 615

616	Burgess, D. (1989, February). Alpha particles in field-aligned beams upstream of the
617	bow shock: Simulations. Geophys. Res. Lett., $16(2)$ , 163-166. doi: 10.1029/
618	GL016i002p00163
619	Burgess, D., & Scholer, M. (2015). Collisionless Shocks in Space Plasmas. Cam-
620	bridge University Press.
621	Cara, A., Lavraud, B., Fedorov, A., De Keyser, J., DeMarco, R., Marcucci, M. F.,
622	Bruno, R. (2017, February). Electrostatic analyzer design for solar wind
623	proton measurements with high temporal, energy, and angular resolutions. $J$ .
624	Geophys. Res., 122(2), 1439-1450. doi: 10.1002/2016JA023269
625	David, L., Fraschetti, F., Giacalone, J., Wimmer-Schweingruber, R. F., Berger, L.,
626	& Lario, D. (2022, March). In Situ Measurement of the Energy Fraction in
627	Suprathermal and Energetic Particles at ACE, Wind, and PSP Interplanetary
628	Shocks. Astrophys. J., 928(1), 66. doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac54af
629	De Keyser, J., Lavraud, B., Přech, L., Neefs, E., Berkenbosch, S., Beeckman, B.,
630	Brienza, D. (2018, October). Beam tracking strategies for fast acquisition of
631	solar wind velocity distribution functions with high energy and angular resolu-
632	tions. Ann Geophys, $36(5)$ , 1285-1302. doi: 10.5194/angeo-36-1285-2018
633	De Marco, R., Marcucci, M. F., Bruno, R., D'Amicis, R., Servidio, S., Valentini, F.,
634	$\ldots$ Salatti, M. (2016, August). Importance of energy and angular resolutions
635	in top-hat electrostatic analysers for solar wind proton measurements. $Journal$
636	of Instrumentation, 11(8), C08010. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/11/08/C08010
637	Dewar, R. L. (1970, November). Interaction between Hydromagnetic Waves and
638	a Time-Dependent, Inhomogeneous Medium. Phys Fluids, 13(11), 2710-2720.
639	doi: 10.1063/1.1692854
640	Ergun, R. E., Tucker, S., Westfall, J., Goodrich, K. A., Malaspina, D. M., Summers,
641	D., Cully, C. M. (2016, March). The Axial Double Probe and Fields
642	Signal Processing for the MMS Mission. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 167-188. doi:
643	10.1007/s11214-014-0115-x
644	Fuselier, S. A., Shelley, E. G., Balsiger, H., Geiss, J., Goldstein, B. E., Goldstein,
645	R., & Ip, W. H. (1988, June). Cometary $H_2^+$ and solar wind $He^{2+}$ dynam-
646	ics across the Halley cometopause. Geophys. Res. Lett., $15(6)$ , 549-552. doi:
647	10.1029/GL015i006p00549

Gedalin, M. (2017, January). Effect of alpha particles on the shock structure. J.

649	Geophys. Res., $122(1)$ , 71-76. doi: $10.1002/2016$ JA023460
650	Gedalin, M. (2020, May). Large-scale versus Small-scale Fields in the Shock Front:
651	Effect on the Particle Motion. Astrophys. J., 895(1), 59. doi: 10.3847/1538
652	-4357/ab8af0
653	Gershman, D. J., Dorelli, J. C., Avanov, L. A., Gliese, U., Barrie, A., Schiff, C.,
654	Pollock, C. J. (2019, December). Systematic Uncertainties in Plasma
655	Parameters Reported by the Fast Plasma Investigation on NASA's Magneto-
656	spheric Multiscale Mission. J. Geophys. Res., $124(12)$ , $10,345-10,359$ . doi:
657	10.1029/2019JA026980
658	Gershman, D. J., Dorelli, J. C., FViñas, A., & Pollock, C. J. (2015, August).
659	The calculation of moment uncertainties from velocity distribution func-
660	tions with random errors. J. Geophys. Res., $120(8)$ , 6633-6645. doi:
661	10.1002/2014JA020775
662	Gingell, I., Schwartz, S. J., Eastwood, J. P., Burch, J. L., Ergun, R. E., Fuselier, S.,
663	$\dots$ Wilder, F. (2019, February). Observations of Magnetic Reconnection in
664	the Transition Region of Quasi-Parallel Shocks. Geophys. Res. Lett., $46(3)$ ,
665	1177-1184. doi: $10.1029/2018$ GL081804
666	Gingell, I., Schwartz, S. J., Eastwood, J. P., Stawarz, J. E., Burch, J. L., Ergun,
667	R. E., Wilder, F. (2020, January). Statistics of Reconnecting Current
668	Sheets in the Transition Region of Earth's Bow Shock. J. Geophys. Res.,
669	125(1), e27119. doi: 10.1029/2019JA027119
670	Goldman, M. V., Newman, D. L., Eastwood, J. P., & Lapenta, G. (2020, December).
671	Multibeam Energy Moments of Multibeam Particle Velocity Distributions. $J$ .
672	Geophys. Res., $125(12)$ , e28340. doi: 10.1029/2020JA028340
673	Goldman, M. V., Newman, D. L., Eastwood, J. P., Lapenta, G., Burch, J. L.,
674	& Giles, B. (2021, October). Multi-beam energy moments of measured
675	compound ion velocity distributions. Phys Plasmas, $28(10)$ , 102305. doi:
676	10.1063/5.0063431
677	Goodrich, K. A., Ergun, R., Schwartz, S. J., Wilson, L. B., Newman, D., Wilder,
678	F. D., Andersson, L. (2018, November). MMS Observations of Elec-
679	trostatic Waves in an Oblique Shock Crossing. J. Geophys. Res., 123(11),
680	9430-9442. doi: $10.1029/2018$ JA025830
681	Harten, R., & Clark, K. (1995, February). The Design Features of the GGS Wind

682	and Polar Spacecraft. Sp. Sci. Rev., 71(1-4), 23-40. doi: 10.1007/BF00751324
683	Johlander, A., Vaivads, A., Khotyaintsev, Y. V., Gingell, I., Schwartz, S. J., Giles,
684	B. L., Russell, C. T. (2018). Shock ripples observed by the MMS space-
685	craft: ion reflection and dispersive properties. Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion,
686	60, 125006.doi: 10.1088/1361-6587/aae920
687	Kis, A., Scholer, M., Klecker, B., Möbius, E., Lucek, E. A., Rème, H., Kucharek,
688	H. (2004, October). Multi-spacecraft observations of diffuse ions up-
689	stream of Earth's bow shock. Geophys. Res. Lett., 31(20), L20801. doi:
690	10.1029/2004GL020759
691	Krasnoselskikh, V., Balikhin, M., Walker, S. N., Schwartz, S. J., Sundkvist, D.,
692	Lobzin, V., Comisel, H. (2013, October). The Dynamic Quasiperpen-
693	dicular Shock: Cluster Discoveries. Sp. Sci. Rev., 178(2-4), 535-598. doi:
694	10.1007/s11214-013-9972-y
695	Kucharek, H., Möbius, E., Li, W., Farrugia, C. J., Popecki, M. A., Galvin, A. B.,
696	Bochsler, P. A. (2003, October). On the source and acceleration of en-
697	ergetic He <sup>+</sup> : A long-term observation with ACE/SEPICA. J. Geophys. Res.,
698	108(A10), 8040. doi: 10.1029/2003JA009938
699	Kucharek, H., Möbius, E., Scholer, M., Mouikis, C., Kistler, L., Horbury, T.,
700	Bosqued, J. (2004, July). On the origin of field-aligned beams at the quasi-
701	perpendicular bow shock: multi-spacecraft observations by Cluster. $Ann$
702	Geophys, 22(7), 2301-2308.doi: 10.5194/angeo-22-2301-2004
703	Leroy, M. M., Winske, D., Goodrich, C. C., Wu, C. S., & Papadopoulos, K. (1982,
704	July). The structure of perpendicular bow shocks. J. Geophys. Res., $87(A7)$ ,
705	5081-5094. doi: 10.1029/JA087iA07p05081
706	Lindqvist, PA., Olsson, G., Torbert, R. B., King, B., Granoff, M., Rau, D.,
707	Tucker, S. (2016, March). The Spin-Plane Double Probe Elec-
708	tric Field Instrument for MMS. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 137-165. doi:
709	10.1007/s11214-014-0116-9
710	Lowe, R. E., & Burgess, D. (2003, March). The properties and causes of rippling
711	in quasi-perpendicular collisionless shock fronts. Annales Geophysicae, $21(3)$ ,
712	671-679. doi: 10.5194/angeo-21-671-2003
713	Madanian, H., Desai, M. I., Schwartz, S. J., Wilson, I., L. B., Fuselier, S. A., Burch,
714	J. L., Lindquist, P. A. (2021, February). The Dynamics of a High Mach

715	Number Quasi-perpendicular Shock: MMS Observations. Astrophys. J.,
716	908(1), 40. doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/abcb88
717	Madanian, H., Schwartz, S. J., Fuselier, S. A., Burgess, D., Turner, D. L., Chen, L
718	J., Starkey, M. J. (2021, July). Direct Evidence for Magnetic Reflection of
719	Heavy Ions from High Mach Number Collisionless Shocks. Astrophys. J. Lett.,
720	915(1), L19. doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ac0aee
721	Paschmann, G., & Daly, P. W. (2008). Notes on "ISSI SR-001". In <i>Multi-Spacecraft</i>
722	Analysis Methods Revisited (p. xi). ESA Communications for The Interna-
723	tional Space Science Institute.
724	Paschmann, G., Sckopke, N., Bame, S. J., & Gosling, J. T. (1982, August). Observa-
725	tions of gyrating ions in the foot of the nearly perpendicular bow shock. $Geo$ -
726	phys. Res. Lett., $9(8)$ , 881-884. doi: 10.1029/GL009i008p00881
727	Pollock, C., Moore, T., Jacques, A., Burch, J., Gliese, U., Saito, Y., others
728	(2016, March). Fast Plasma Investigation for Magnetospheric Multiscale. Space
729	Sci. Rev., 199, 331-406. doi: 10.1007/s11214-016-0245-4
730	Russell, C. T., Anderson, B. J., Baumjohann, W., Bromund, K. R., Dearborn,
731	D., Fischer, D., Richter, I. (2016, March). The Magnetospheric Mul-
732	tiscale Magnetometers. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 189-256. doi: 10.1007/
733	s11214-014-0057-3
734	Schwartz, S. J. (1998, January). Shock and Discontinuity Normals, Mach Numbers,
735	and Related Parameters. ISSI Scientific Reports Series, 1, 249-270.
736	Schwartz, S. J. (2006, June). Shocks: Commonalities in Solar-Terrestrial Chains. $Sp$ .
737	Sci. Rev., $124(1-4)$ , 333-344. doi: 10.1007/s11214-006-9093-y
738	Schwartz, S. J., Ergun, R., Kucharek, H., Wilson, L., Chen, LJ., Goodrich, K.,
739	Strangeway, R. (2021, August). Evaluating the deHoffmann-Teller Cross-Shock
740	Potential at Real Collisionless Shocks. J. Geophys. Res., $126(8)$ , e29295. doi:
741	10.1029/2021JA029295
742	Schwartz, S. J., & Marsch, E. (1983, December). The radial evolution of a single so-
743	lar wind plasma parcel. J. Geophys. Res., $88({\rm A12}),9919\text{-}9932.$ doi: 10.1029/
744	$\rm JA088iA12p09919$
745	Schwartz, S. J., Thomsen, M. F., Bame, S. J., & Stansberry, J. (1988, November).
746	Electron heating and the potential jump across fast mode shocks. J. Geophys.
747	Res., 93, 12923-12931. doi: 10.1029/JA093iA11p12923

748	Schwartz, S. J., Zweibel, E. G., & Goldman, M. (2013, October). Microphysics in
749	Astrophysical Plasmas. Sp. Sci. Rev., $178(2-4)$ , 81-99. doi: 10.1007/s11214-013
750	-9975-8
751	Sckopke, N., Paschmann, G., Bame, S. J., Gosling, J. T., & Russell, C. T. (1983,
752	August). Evolution of ion distributions across the nearly perpendicular bow
753	shock: specularly and non-specularly reflected-gyrating ions. J. Geophys. Res.,
754	88(A8), 6121-6136. doi: 10.1029/JA088iA08p06121
755	Scudder, J. D., Mangeney, A., Lacombe, C., Harvey, C. C., & Aggson, T. L. (1986,
756	October). The resolved layer of a collisionless, high $\beta$ , supercritical, quasi-
757	perpendicular shock wave. 2. Dissipative fluid electrodynamics. J. Geophys.
758	Res., $91(A10)$ , 11053-11074. doi: 10.1029/JA091iA10p11053
759	Scudder, J. D., Mangeney, A., Lacombe, C., Harvey, C. C., Wu, C. S., & Anderson,
760	R. R. (1986, October). The resolved layer of a collisionless, high $\beta$ , supercrit-
761	ical, quasi-perpendicular shock wave, 3. Vlasov electrodynamics. $J.$ Geophys.
762	$Res.,\ 91 ({\rm A10}),\ 11075\text{-}11098.$ doi: 10.1029/JA091iA10p11075
763	Slavin, J. A., & Holzer, R. E. (1981, December). Solar wind flow about the ter-
764	restrial planets, 1. Modeling bow shock position and shape. J. Geophys. Res.,
765	86(A13), 11401-11418.doi: 10.1029/JA086iA13p11401
766	Stone, R. G., & Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-
766 767	Stone, R. G., & Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio- sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geo-
766 767 768	Stone, R. G., & Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio- sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geo- physical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034
766 767 768 769	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio- sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geo- physical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geo-</li> </ul>
766 767 768 769 770	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> </ul>
766 767 768 769 770 771	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> <li>Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, PA., LeCon-</li> </ul>
766 767 768 769 770 771 771	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> <li>Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, PA., LeContel, O., Lappalainen, K. (2016, March). The FIELDS Instrument Suite</li> </ul>
766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> <li>Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, PA., LeContel, O., Lappalainen, K. (2016, March). The FIELDS Instrument Suite on MMS: Scientific Objectives, Measurements, and Data Products. Space Sci.</li> </ul>
766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> <li>Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, PA., LeContel, O., Lappalainen, K. (2016, March). The FIELDS Instrument Suite on MMS: Scientific Objectives, Measurements, and Data Products. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 105-135. doi: 10.1007/s11214-014-0109-8</li> </ul>
766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> <li>Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, PA., LeContel, O., Lappalainen, K. (2016, March). The FIELDS Instrument Suite on MMS: Scientific Objectives, Measurements, and Data Products. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 105-135. doi: 10.1007/s11214-014-0109-8</li> <li>Trattner, K. J., &amp; Scholer, M. (1993, September). Distributions and thermalization</li> </ul>
766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> <li>Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, PA., LeContel, O., Lappalainen, K. (2016, March). The FIELDS Instrument Suite on MMS: Scientific Objectives, Measurements, and Data Products. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 105-135. doi: 10.1007/s11214-014-0109-8</li> <li>Trattner, K. J., &amp; Scholer, M. (1993, September). Distributions and thermalization of protons and alpha particles at collisionless quasi-parallel shocks. Ann Geo-</li> </ul>
766 767 768 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> <li>Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, PA., LeContel, O., Lappalainen, K. (2016, March). The FIELDS Instrument Suite on MMS: Scientific Objectives, Measurements, and Data Products. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 105-135. doi: 10.1007/s11214-014-0109-8</li> <li>Trattner, K. J., &amp; Scholer, M. (1993, September). Distributions and thermalization of protons and alpha particles at collisionless quasi-parallel shocks. Ann Geophys, 11(9), 774-789.</li> </ul>
766 767 768 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777	<ul> <li>Stone, R. G., &amp; Tsurutani, B. T. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the helio-sphere. A tutorial review. Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 34. doi: 10.1029/GM034</li> <li>Swisdak, M. (2016, January). Quantifying gyrotropy in magnetic reconnection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(1), 43-49. doi: 10.1002/2015GL066980</li> <li>Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, PA., LeContel, O., Lappalainen, K. (2016, March). The FIELDS Instrument Suite on MMS: Scientific Objectives, Measurements, and Data Products. Space Sci. Rev., 199, 105-135. doi: 10.1007/s11214-014-0109-8</li> <li>Trattner, K. J., &amp; Scholer, M. (1993, September). Distributions and thermalization of protons and alpha particles at collisionless quasi-parallel shocks. Ann Geophys, 11(9), 774-789.</li> <li>Tsurutani, B. T., &amp; Stone, R. G. (1985, January). Collisionless shocks in the heitomagenetic states of the store of t</li></ul>

<sup>780</sup> Union Geophysical Monograph Series, 35. doi: 10.1029/GM035

781	Wang, S., Chen, LJ., Bessho, N., Hesse, M., Wilson, L. B., Giles, B., Burch,
782	J. L. (2019, January). Observational Evidence of Magnetic Reconnection
783	in the Terrestrial Bow Shock Transition Region. $Geophys. Res. Lett., 46(2),$
784	562-570. doi: 10.1029/2018GL080944
785	Wilson, L. B., Brosius, A. L., Gopalswamy, N., Nieves-Chinchilla, T., Szabo,
786	A., Hurley, K., TenBarge, J. M. (2021, June). A quarter century of
787	wind spacecraft discoveries. Rev. Geophys., $59(2)$ , $e2020$ RG000714. doi:
788	10.1029/2020rg $000714$
789	Wilson, L. B., Sibeck, D. G., Breneman, A. W., Le Contel, O., Cully, C., Turner,
790	D. L., Malaspina, D. M. (2014, August). Quantified energy dissipation
791	rates in the terrestrial bow shock: 2. Waves and dissipation. J. Geophys. Res.,
792	119(8), 6475-6495.doi: 10.1002/2014JA019930
793	Wilson, L. B., III, Chen, LJ., Wang, S., Schwartz, S. J., Turner, D. L., Stevens,
794	M. L., Goodrich, K. A. (2019a, December). Electron Energy Partition
795	across Interplanetary Shocks. II. Statistics. Astrophys. J. Supp., 245(2), 24.
796	doi: $10.3847/1538-4365/ab5445$
797	Wilson, L. B., III, Chen, LJ., Wang, S., Schwartz, S. J., Turner, D. L., Stevens,
798	M. L., Goodrich, K. A. (2019b, July). Electron Energy Partition across
799	Interplanetary Shocks. I. Methodology and Data Product. Astrophys. J. Supp.,
800	243(1), 8. doi: 10.3847/1538-4365/ab22bd
801	Wilson, L. B., III, Chen, LJ., Wang, S., Schwartz, S. J., Turner, D. L., Stevens,
802	M. L., Goodrich, K. A. (2020, April). Electron Energy Partition
803	across Interplanetary Shocks. III. Analysis. Astrophys. J., $893(1)$ , 22. doi:
804	10.3847/1538-4357/ab7d39
805	Wilson, L. B., III, Stevens, M. L., Kasper, J. C., Klein, K. G., Maruca, B. A., Bale,
806	S. D., Salem, C. S. (2018, June). The Statistical Properties of Solar Wind
807	Temperature Parameters Near 1 au. Astrophys. J. Supp., 236(2), 41. doi:
808	10.3847/1538-4365/aab71c
809	Woods, L. C. (1969, September). On the structure of collisionless magneto—plasma
810	shock waves at super—critical Alfvén—Mach numbers. J. Plasma Phys., $3(3)$ ,
811	435-447. doi: 10.1017/S0022377800004517
812	Young, D. T., Burch, J. L., Gomez, R. G., Santos, A. D. L., Miller, G. P., Wilson,

P., ... Webster, J. M. (2017). Hot plasma composition analyzer for the magne-

813

tospheric multiscale mission. doi: 10.1007/978-94-024-0861-4\_13

Zank, G. P., Nakanotani, M., Zhao, L., Du, S., Adhikari, L., Che, H., & le 815 Roux, J. (2021).Flux ropes, turbulence, and collisionless perpendicu-

lar shock waves: High plasma beta case. Astrophys. J., 913(2), 127. doi: 817 10.3847/1538-4357/abf7c8 818

#### Appendix A Errors and Uncertainties 819

Given the variety of instruments and assumptions that contribute to the values in 820 Table 2, there are a range of contributions to the corresponding errors and uncertain-821 ties. These include both statistical errors, due to either counting statistics or averaging, 822 and systematic errors arising from calibrations and underlying assumptions. In this ap-823 pendix we provide a catalog of these errors and uncertainties and estimate their quan-824 titative impact on the results. 825

826

814

816

#### A1 Upstream parameters

Upstream parameters from the Wind spacecraft were lagged by 65 minutes, in this 827 case based simply on the measured solar wind speed, to account for the transit from near 828 L1 to the bow shock. Over the 20 minute averaging period, the solar wind velocity var-829 ied by only a few km/s corresponding to a 1% standard error. Propagating from L1 to 830 the bow shock is often challenging, but in this case the Wind velocity measurements re-831 main constant to within these errors for at least an hour. Systematic errors originate from 832 the  $\Delta E/E \sim 20\%$  energy resolution of the detector and could thus be 10% or more af-833 ter the moment integration, i.e., larger than the statistical uncertainty. The Wind 3DP 834 onboard  $\alpha$ -particle velocity is similarly constant with a larger, high frequency noise com-835 ponent that contributes a  $\pm 20$  km/s uncertainty. In view of the low alpha density this 836  $\sim 10\%$  error has a relatively minor influence on the primary shock energetics. 837

The proton density returned by Wind is  $\sim 3.5 \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$ , which is grossly at odds with 838 the WAVES upper hybrid resonance line that suggests an electron density of  $5 \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$ . Taken 839 at face value, the measured proton density would yield an imbalance in energy flux at 840 the bow shock of roughly 40%. We have not explored the counting statistics associated 841 with this measurement, but all swept electrostatic analyzers suffer limitations linked to 842 their angular bins in capturing all the solar wind beam. 843

-34-

This illustrates the difficulty of combining data from widely-separated locations, 844 and thus implicitly suggests that our overall error budget is a factor of two. Guided by 845 the WAVES data, we impose physical constraints such as mass flux continuity across the 846 bow shock to ground the upstream density to match the MMS downstream value. This 847 enables us to make progress but leaves the unsatisfactory imposition of assuming some 848 of the physics we are seeking to verify observationally. In a similar fashion we force mass 849 conservation for the solar wind  $\alpha$ 's, and use a zero current condition together with over-850 all charge neutrality to constrain the electron density and velocity. 851

The Wind 3DP instrument routinely returns data from a  $8 \times 8$  anode array. This 852 enables good determination of the isotropic portion of the proton temperature tensor, 853 but not higher moments such as the heat flux [LB Wilson, III, private communication] 854 which we subsequently neglect. Some of this uncertainty arises from the need to sepa-855 rate the protons and  $\alpha$ 's from the single E/q data product. The statistical fluctuations 856 over our 20 minute averaging window are  $\pm 10\%$ . The electron temperature fluctuations 857 are  $\sim 3\%$ . From Table 2 we see that such uncertainties, which enter into the enthalpy 858 fluxes, have a negligible impact on the overall energetics. They do, however, contribute 859 to statistical uncertainties in the upstream plasma  $\beta$ 's of 10 - 15%. Given our previ-860 ous discussion of instrumental limitations, the actual error in  $\beta$  is much larger. 861

The interplanetary magnetic field contains structure on all scales that makes the propagation from L1 to the bow shock particularly prone to error. Thus we propagate the field from MMS2, the MMS spacecraft furthest upstream. In fact, in our first example the averaged field at Wind differs by only 7° from the one shown in Table 2 and by 4% in magnitude. Figure 4b illustrates the variability of the upstream field including both high frequency oscillations and some systematic variations in direction (e.g., around 19:45).

868

### A2 Shock normal and NIF determination

There are numerous methods for estimating the normal vector at a shock, most of which are summarized in Schwartz (1998). In the case of the bow shock, the empirical model fits are usually the most robust, especially in the subsolar region. Methods based on both models and physical parameters can agree to within  $5-10^{\circ}$  depending on the applicabliity of any particular method. This provides a measure of the uncertainty. Such errors contribute to an uncertainty in the upstream ram pressure of 1–5% that increases around the flanks of the bow shock.

Transforming velocities and electric fields in the NIF shock rest frame is an essential step performed via (3). For our detailed example, the shock speed in the spacecraft frame was well-determined by the time of crossings of the collinear MMS spacecraft and was < 10 km/s. The transformation velocity  $\mathbf{V}^{SC2NIF}$  is essentially the flow tangential to the shock. The determination of the shock normal, bulk flow speed and direction all contribute to tangential transformation velocity errors  $\sim 10-15\%$ , i.e., 20–30 km/s.

882

#### A3 DC electric fields and Poynting flux

Our estimates of the upstream and downstream NIF DC electric field assume these are given by the frozen-in condition  $\mathbf{E} = -\mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{B}$ . Typically the uncertainty in DC magnetic field measurements is negligible by comparison to that in  $\mathbf{V}$ . The flow and transformation velocities contribute to errors 10–15% in  $\mathbf{E}$  and hence the DC Poynting flux estimate has a similar 10–15% uncertainty. The downstream DC Poynting flux errors are dominated by the fluctuations in velocity and magnetic field, which are discussed below.

890

#### A4 Downstream parameters

All downstream parameters are calculated from averaging MMS data. The statistical standard deviations of the various parameters are: proton density 10%, proton velocity (7.5, 19, 30)% in the three GSE components, proton pressure 15% for the diagonal elements and ~ 50% for the off-diagonal elements, proton heat flux < 1%,  $\alpha$  density 20%,  $\alpha$  velocity (20, 22, 23)%,  $\alpha$  xx pressure 33%, electron density 15%, electron pressure diagonal elements 18%, electron heat flux 250%, magnetic field (26, 26, 34)%, electric field (140, 90, 60)%.

While these standard deviations are relevant for our determination of average downstream parameters, they include the physical fluctuations due to waves and turbulence. To estimate the instrumental errors we turn to the counting statistics.

#### 901 A5 Counting statistics

The MMS FPI team provides routine uncertainties in moments of the velocity space 902 distributions propagated from the counting statistics at the anodes (Gershman et al., 903 2015). Representative uncertainties for the upstream (downstream) regions are: proton 904 density 2% (1%), proton x-GSE velocity 2% (1%) but highly variable upstream, proton 905 (xx) pressure component 25% (2%), proton heatflux x-component 25% (20%) but highly 906 variable downstream, electron density 1% (0.5%), electron x-GSE velocity 3% (4%), elec-907 tron (xx) pressure component 2.5% (0.5%) but highly variable upstream, electron heat-908 flux x-component 30% (50%) but highly variable. We employ the FPI-supplied spintone 909 correction to the electron bulk velocity. This is of order 10 km/s in the GSE x-y com-910 ponents far downstream, and 30 km/s upstream. This spintone represents a residual sys-911 tematic error in the electron velocity. A smaller spintone, of order 5 km/s, bleeds into 912 GSE  $V_{ez}$ . The electron heat flux uncertainties are typically 10's of  $\mu W/m^2$ , compara-913 ble to the highly variable fluxes shown in Figure 2f. 914

These counting statistics do not reflect systematic errors related to, for example, limited energy or angular resolution or incomplete coverage of angle-energy space due to the instrument sweep, angle deflection system and satellite spin (Gershman et al., 2019). These effects are clearly manifested in the upstream proton density (black trace in Figure 2) despite the high count rates which lead to only a 2% counting statistics uncertainty.