The Effect of Compression Induced Chorus Waves on 10s to 100s eV Electron Precipitation

Alexa J. Halford¹, Katherine Garcia-Sage¹, Ian Mann², Drew L. Turner³, and Aaron Breneman⁴

¹NASA Goddard Space Flight Center ²University of Alberta ³The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory ⁴The University of Minnesota

November 23, 2022

Abstract

On 7 January 2014, a solar storm erupted, which eventually compressed the Earth's magnetosphere leading to the generation of chorus waves. These waves enhanced local wave-particle interactions and led to the precipitation of electrons from 10s eV to 100s keV. This paper shows observations of a low energy cutoff in the precipitation spectrum from Van Allen Probe B Helium Oxygen Proton Electron (HOPE) measurements. This low energy cutoff is well replicated by the predicted loss calculated from pitch angle diffusion coefficients from wave and plasma observations on Probe B. To our knowledge, this is the first time a single spacecraft has been used to demonstrate an accurate theoretical prediction for chorus wave-induced precipitation and its low energy cutoff. The specific properties of the precipitating soft electron spectrum have implications for ionospheric activity, with the lowest energies mainly contributing to thermospheric and ionospheric upwelling, which influences satellite drag and ionospheric outflow.

The Effect of Compression Induced Chorus Waves on 10s to 100s eV Electron Precipitation

A. J. Halford¹, K. Garcia-Sage¹, I. R. Mann ², D. L. Turner ³, A. W. Breneman ¹

¹NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, College Park, MD, USA ²Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada ³Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, MD, United States

Key Points:

1

2

3

4

5 6 7

8

13

9	•	Upper Band Chorus waves can have a minimum resonant energy in the 10s eV en-
10		ergy range.
11	•	Changes in the minimum resonant energy can change the cut off for what lower
12		energy particles will be lost.

• The lower energy cut off can be observed in the Van Allen Probes HOPE data.

Corresponding author: A.J. Halford, alexa.j.halford@nasa.gov

14 Abstract

On 7 January 2014, a solar storm erupted, which eventually compressed the Earth's mag-15 netosphere leading to the generation of chorus waves. These waves enhanced local wave-16 particle interactions and led to the precipitation of electrons from 10s eV to 100s keV. 17 This paper shows observations of a low energy cutoff in the precipitation spectrum from 18 Van Allen Probe B Helium Oxygen Proton Electron (HOPE) measurements. This low 19 energy cutoff is well replicated by the predicted loss calculated from pitch angle diffu-20 sion coefficients from wave and plasma observations on Probe B. To our knowledge, this 21 is the first time a single spacecraft has been used to demonstrate an accurate theoret-22 ical prediction for chorus wave-induced precipitation and its low energy cutoff. The spe-23 cific properties of the precipitating soft electron spectrum have implications for ionospheric 24 activity, with the lowest energies mainly contributing to thermospheric and ionospheric 25 upwelling, which influences satellite drag and ionospheric outflow. 26

27 Plain Language Summary

On 7 January 2014, a large storm erupted from the Sun. This storm encountered 28 the Earth and compressed the magnetosphere a few days later. The compression of the 29 magnetosphere led to the creation of chorus waves, a wave-type known to interact only 30 with electrons with specific energies. In this case, the waves interacted with electrons 31 in the magnetosphere's outer radiation belt. They caused the loss of electrons from 10s 32 33 eV to 100s keV into the ionosphere and upper atmosphere. This paper uses theory to determine which energies we expect will interact with the observed chorus wave. We use 34 the HOPE instrument from the Van Allen Probes to see if our predictions are correct. 35 We care about these processes because the loss of these electrons can affect ionospheric 36 activity. 37

38 1 Introduction

Upper band chorus waves have a minimum resonant energy typically found in the 39 energy range of 10s - 100s eV and are known to lead to the loss of these electrons to the 40 upper atmosphere (e.g., Meredith et al., 2003; Summers et al., 2007; Ni et al., 2008; Z. Su 41 et al., 2010; Li et al., 2011). The precipitation of electrons just above this cutoff energy 42 into the upper atmosphere may help drive both neutral thermospheric upwelling, which 43 influences satellite drag (e.g., Clemmons et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2012; Deng et al., 2011), 44 and ion upflow that may lead to outflow (e.g., Y.-J. Su et al., 1999; Zeng & Horwitz, 2007; 45 Redmon et al., 2014, and references within these papers). See et al. (1997) showed cor-46 relations between up-flows and electron precipitation for energies less than 80 eV observed 47 by the DE 2 satellite at 850 - 950 km altitude. (Redmon et al., 2014) demonstrated us-48 ing single field-line modelling that 50 eV precipitation is more effective than higher en-49 ergies at producing O^+ upflow at 850 km altitude. The effective precipitation energies 50 for thermospheric upwelling are only slightly higher, with results from Clemmons et al. 51 (2008) and Zhang et al. (2012) indicating that precipitation energies of 100 eV and 200 52 eV act to increase thermospheric density at 400 km. The upflow ion populations pro-53 vide the source population for ion outflow into the magnetosphere. The outflow, in turn, 54 can affect reconnection rates, sawtooth events, electromagnetic ion cyclotron wave growth, 55 and other geomagnetic processes (e.g., Baker et al., 1982; Daglis et al., 1999; Ouellette 56 et al., 2013; Garcia-Sage et al., 2015; Halford, Fraser, et al., 2016, and references within 57 these papers). Indeed, Gkioulidou et al. (2019) found evidence of ion outflow directly 58 into the inner magnetosphere, leading to the possible formation of the O+ torus just out-59 side of the plasmapause (e.g., Nosé et al., 2015, and references therein). Ion outflow may 60 require the presence of multiple energization processes working in concert (e.g., Zeng & 61 Horwitz, 2007) where the chorus wave-induced precipitation presented here indicates one 62 potential contributing mechanism. 63

On 7 January 2014, a coronal mass ejection (CME) erupted off of the Sun, and the 64 edge of the ICME arrived at the Earth on 9 January at 20:10:30 UT (e.g., Möstl et al., 65 2015; Mays et al., 2015; Halford et al., 2015; Halford, McGregor, et al., 2016). The in-66 terplanetary magnetic field (IMF) B_z component was positive or near zero for the ma-67 jority of the event (Figure 2 in Halford et al., 2015), and therefore did not trigger a ge-68 omagnetic storm or substorm in the Earth's magnetosphere (Mays et al., 2015; Halford 69 et al., 2015). However, this encounter did significantly compress the magnetopause in-70 wards by 1 Earth radii (RE) as determined by Halford et al. (2015). Three Balloon Ar-71 ray for Radiation belt Relativistic Electron Loss (BARREL) payloads (2K, 2L, and 2X) 72 X-ray detectors inferred loss of 10s - 100s keV radiation belt electrons. They mapped 73 to the dayside inner magnetosphere and were near conjugate to both of the Van Allen 74 Probes (see Figure 4 Halford et al., 2015). Halford et al. (2015) discussed the loss of 100s 75 keV electrons from the magnetopause compression and observed chorus, hiss, and elec-76 tromagnetic ion cyclotron waves. The loss of these particles due to the compression de-77 scribed in detail in Halford et al. (2015) is summarised in the following steps: First, compression-78 driven ExB drift motion pushed particles inward by approximately 1 R_E within 2 min-79 utes. This inward motion, assuming conservation of the first and second adiabatic in-80 variants, increased the particles' pitch angles, but also moved them into a region with 81 a larger loss cone (e.g. Rae et al., 2018). As discussed in Halford et al. (2015), the amount 82 of loss cone increase exceeded the increase in pitch angle, resulting in a loss of particles 83 within 0.5° of the initial $\sim 3^{\circ}$ loss cone. The chorus wave is then observed to grow and 84 further interacts with the particles and pitch angle scatters them into the loss cone. While 85 BARREL was limited in the energy range of electron precipitation that could be inferred, 86 the observed wave was theoretically able to interact with energies in the 10s of eV range. 87

In this paper, we examine the effect of the upper band chorus on lower-energy elec-88 trons. The observed chorus wave on January 9th 2014 can precipitate electrons down 89 to much lower energies of 10s of eV, Figure 1 (e.g., Z. Su et al., 2010; Li et al., 2011; Hal-90 ford et al., 2015), well below the minimum energy threshold observable by BARREL, but 91 within the observational range of the HOPE instrument. Although this event did not 92 result in a geomagnetic storm or a significant change in the trapped population of the 93 radiation belts, it has allowed for a close examination of the wave-particle dynamics which 94 occur during geomagnetic compressions, and a comparison of the relative loss due to the 95 triggered plasma waves and the large-scale electric field impulse. In this paper, we will 96 focus on the expected and observed interactions between the chorus waves and the 10s 97 to 100s of eV electrons at the location of Van Allen Probe B. 98

99 2 Data

The two Van Allen Probes satellites are in ~ 9 hour near-equatorial elliptical or-100 bits with an apogee near L = 6 (Mauk et al., 2012). During the event considered here, 101 Van Allen Probe B was at an L-value of approximately 5.8, an MLT value of 13.2, and 102 a magnetic latitude of approximately 1 deg off the magnetic equator. As the event stud-103 ied in this paper only lasted approximately 10 minutes, the satellite is relatively station-104 ary. Each of the Van Allen Probe satellites were equipped with instruments allowing for 105 observations of waves and particles across multiple orders of magnitude in amplitude and 106 energy. For this study, we will use data from the Electric and Magnetic Fields Instru-107 ment Suite and Integrated Science (EMFISIS) wave instrument (Kletzing et al., 2013), 108 as well as the Helium, Oxygen, Proton, and Electron (HOPE) mass spectrometer (Funsten 109 et al., 2013) from the Energetic Particle Composition and Thermal Plasma Suite (ECT; 110 (Spence et al., 2013)). The HOPE instrument covers an electron energy range of ~ 10 111 eV - 50 keV. 112

113 **3 Results**

Using the observed wave and plasma characteristics given in Halford et al. (2015) we can solve for the minimum resonant energy, E_{min} , given in equation 16 in Summers et al. (2007) as

$$E_{min} = \left[1 - \frac{(v_{||})^2}{c^2}\right]^{-1/2} - 1.$$
 (1)

where c is the speed of light and $v_{||}$ is the particle's parallel velocity. The expected pitch angle diffusion $(D_{\alpha,\alpha})$ can be written as

$$D_{\alpha,\alpha} = \frac{\pi \Omega_{\sigma}^2}{2\rho |\Omega_e|} \frac{1}{(E+1)^2} \sum_s \sum_j \frac{R\left(1 - \frac{x_j \cos\alpha}{y_j \beta}\right)^2 |\delta x_j / \delta y_j|}{\delta x |(\beta \cos\alpha - \delta x_j / \delta y_j|} e^{-\left(\frac{x_j - x_m}{\delta x}\right)^2}$$
(2)

for specific energies as described in Summers et al. (2007) and given in equations 5 and 119 30 of their paper. Within equation 2 E is the dimensionless particle kinetic energy E =120 $(1-v^2/c^2)^{-1/2}-1$ where v is the particle's velocity, $\beta = v/c$, Ω_e is the non-relativistic 121 electron gyro-frequency, Ω_{σ} is the non-relativistic particle gyro-frequency, R is relative 122 wave power, $x = \omega/|\Omega_e|, y = ck/|\Omega_e|$ where k is the wave number, $x_m = \omega_m/|\Omega_e|,$ 123 and $\delta x = \delta \omega / |\Omega_e|$. The particle species is j and s is the wave mode, 1 for R-mode waves. 124 $\delta x_i / \delta y_i$ is further defined in Summers et al. (2007) and is taken from the appropriate 125 dispersion relation. We can then compare our estimates of the energy and pitch angle 126 of the particles affected to the observations from the HOPE instrument on Van Allen 127 Probe B. 128

¹²⁹ In Halford et al. (2015) $D_{\alpha,\alpha}s$ were calculated for electron energies of 10s - 100s of ¹³⁰ keV shown in their Figure 8. In this paper, we consider the wave-particle interactions ¹³¹ for the low energy electrons (10 - 100s eV) where the minimum resonance energy is found. ¹³² We calculate the $D_{\alpha,\alpha}$ for a given HOPE energy channel and compare the expected re-¹³³ sults to the observed pitch angle distributions for the proper HOPE energy bin.

As the shock arrives, the plasmasphere is observed to move earthward of the satel-134 lite, and the chorus wave is observed at Van Allen Probe B as discussed and shown in 135 Halford et al. (2015). As Van Allen Probe A stayed within the plasmaphere/plasmaplume, 136 it did not observe a chorus wave but instead saw a Hiss wave as discussed in Halford et 137 al. (2015). Figure 1 panel a) shows the observations of the chorus wave on Van Allen Probe 138 B located at $L \sim 5.8$. As the wave was generated locally the wave was observed to be 139 approximately normal with the magnetic field. The minimum resonant energy for a cho-140 rus wave depends greatly on the local plasma conditions and wave frequency (Summers 141 et al., 2007; Z. Su et al., 2010). The average wave and plasma conditions throughout the 142 duration of the wave used to calculate $D_{\alpha,\alpha}$ from equation 2 are a wave amplitude of 2.5× 143 10^{-2} nT, a background magnetic field of 167 nT, a cold plasma density of 12 cm⁻³, a 144 centre frequency of ~ $0.56\Omega_e$, and a bandwidth of ~ $0.1\Omega_e$. From Equation 1, these 145 values lead to average minimum resonance energy from the chorus wave of $\sim 26 \text{ eV}$. How-146 ever, it should be noted that the diffusion time scales for energies up to 40 eV are shorter 147 than the observed duration of the wave. Thus we do not expect to observe any signif-148 icant changes in the pitch angle distributions at these lowest energies as can be seen in 149 Figure 1 panels b and c. 150

In panels b,d,f, and h both the expected local (solid line) and bounce averaged (dot-151 ted line) pitch angle diffusion coefficients are plotted for the HOPE energy bins centred 152 around approximately 33 eV, 67 eV, 235 eV (which had the maximum values for both 153 the bounced average and local $D_{\alpha\alpha}$'s), and 660 eV respectively. The X-axis has a min-154 imum value of approximately one over the length of time the chorus wave was observed. 155 The pitch angle distributions for these energy channels are plotted in panels c, e, g, and 156 i. The narrowing of the trapped population is observed and is consistent with the ex-157 pected range of pitch angles affected by the observed chorus wave. 158

In Figure 2, we have plotted the normalised pitch angle distribution during three 159 periods around the event. Panel a-d correspond to the energies plotted in Figure 1. The 160 dashed lines in each of the panels represent the bounce averaged diffusion coefficients from 161 the observed upper band chorus from Figure 1 for reference. The dark blue lines in each 162 panel show the mean normalised pitch angle distribution before the compression event. 163 As expected, the distributions are very isotropic. The green lines are the normalised pitch 164 angle distributions during the period from the start of the compression until the start 165 of the wave. Here we can see a small peak around 90° for all energies. This is consistent 166 with the compression causing the particles' pitch angles to move closer to 90 degrees. The 167 red lines show the mean pitch angle distribution during the period where the chorus wave 168 is observed. The pitch angle distributions have become more peaked. They also show 169 an energy dependence with the higher energy electron populations becoming more steeply 170 peaked. The pitch angles within the 105 and 660 eV channels affected by the chorus wave 171 appear to be more efficiently cleared out than those in the ~ 66 eV channel, as shown 172 in both Figures 1 and 2. This is likely because the bounced-averaged diffusion in both 173 of these higher energy bins exceeds the local strong diffusion limit of $\sim 10^{-4}$ while the 174 bounce averaged diffusion for the 66 eV channel is below this limit (e.g., Shultz & Lanze-175 rotti, 1974; Halford, 2012; Ni et al., 2008). 176

With this event, we can directly compare the different effects that the shock-induced 177 electric field impulse and the chorus waves will have on the 10s to 100s eV particles. The 178 electric field impulse will affect (and ultimately cause loss of) particles independent of 179 energy and species. Specifically, particles of any energy or species within 0.5° of the loss 180 cone are expected to be lost to the atmosphere. The adiabatic transport will move par-181 ticles towards 90 degrees, but as shown in more detail in Halford et al. (2015) the ex-182 pected change in a given pitch angle is less than 2° , and consequently not able to account 183 for the dramatic narrowing of the distribution at the higher energies, e.g., 660 eV in panel 184 i of Figure 1 (see also Rae et al., 2018). The chorus waves, on the other hand, will be 185 selective in the energies and pitch angles of electrons they scatter. 186

¹⁸⁷ 4 Discussion

Electron precipitation at these low energies has been shown through both statis-188 tical studies and modelling to be effective for ion upflow. While secondary electron pro-189 duction will further enhance these low-energy electron populations (Khazanov et al., 2017), 190 this study indicates that chorus waves lead to precipitation of soft electrons with a hard 191 lower energy cutoff within or near the energy range of interest of upwelling and outflow, 192 with the cutoff for this event at ~ 26 eV. To our knowledge, this is the first observation 193 of both the chorus waves and evidence of their minimum resonant energy cut off from 194 in situ observations at the same satellite and at the same time. In this paper, we do not 195 show the impact of the sharp low energy cut off for the precipitating energy spectrum, 196 but we suggest that the effects of this cutoff should be considered for periods when cho-197 rus waves are long-lasting and may influence magnetosphere-ionosphere coupling. This 198 observation demonstrates the role of chorus waves in determining the precipitating en-199 ergy spectra for the population of electrons, which contribute to ionospheric upwelling, 200 or upflow, and preconditioning for ion outflow, as well as a successful prediction of the 201 cutoff from theoretical predictions from equation 1. 202

203 Acknowledgments

A.J. Halford, K. Garcia-Sage, and A. W. Breneman have been supported in part by the

- ²⁰⁵ Goddard Internal Science Funding Model 2022 (Space Precipitation Impacts SPI). A.J.
- ²⁰⁶ Halford was in part supported by NASA under grant numbers NNX15AF66G and NNX15AF59G,

and AJH and AWB under grant NNX15AF58G. K. Garcia-Sage's effort was in part sup-

²⁰⁸ ported by the NASA Internal Scientist Funding Model (HISFM18-0006). I.R. Mann is

²⁰⁹ supported by a Discovery Grant from Canadian NSERC. We acknowledge the NASA Van

- Allen Probes and Harlan E. Spence and Jeff Reeves for use of the data. The ECT data 210
- can be found 211
- http://www.rbsp-ect.lanl.gov/science/DataDirectories.php. HOPE data was in part funded 212
- by RBSP-ECT funding provided by JHU/APL Contract No. 967399 under NASA's Prime 213
- Contract No. NAS5-01072. We would like to thank G. Hospodarsky for help with the 214
- EMFISIS data. EMFISIS data were downloaded from the Van Allen Probes EMFISIS 215
- website at http://emfisis.physics.uiowa.edu/. All other data used in this paper can be 216
- found on CDAweb http://cdaweb.gsfc.nasa.gov. We thank overleaf, github, and zenodo 217
- for making the collaboration easy on this paper. The code and data for creating the fig-218 ures can be found on github
- 219
- https://github.com/AJHalford/Chorus_Emin_Halford_et_al with the 220
- DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3767135 221

References 222

235

236

237

238

- Baker, D. N., Hones, E. W., Young, D. T., & Birn, J. (1982). The possible role of 223 ionospheric oxygen in the initiation and development of plasma sheet instabili-224 ties. Geophysical Research Letters, 9(12), 1337–1340. Retrieved from http:// 225 dx.doi.org/10.1029/GL009i012p01337 doi: 10.1029/GL009i012p01337 226
- Clemmons, J. H., Hecht, J. H., Salem, D. R., & Strickland, D. J. (2008).Ther-227 mospheric density in the earth's magnetic cusp as observed by the streak 228 mission. Geophysical Research Letters, 35(24). Retrieved from https:// 229 doi:
- agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2008GL035972 230 10.1029/2008GL035972 231
- Daglis, I., Thorne, R., Baumjohann, W., & Orsini, S. (1999, Nov). The terres-232 trial ring current: Origin, formation, and decay. Reviews of Geophysics, 37, 233 407 - 438.234
 - Deng, Y., Fuller-Rowell, T. J., Akmaev, R. A., & Ridley, A. J. (2011). Impact of the altitudinal joule heating distribution on the thermosphere. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 116(A5). Retrieved from https://agupubs .onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2010JA016019
- Funsten, H. O., Skoug, R. M., Guthrie, A. A., MacDonald, E. A., Baldonado, J. R., 239 Harper, R. W., ... Chen, J. (2013, March). Helium, Oxygen, Proton, and 240 Electron (HOPE) Mass Spectrometer for the Radiation Belt Storm Probes 241 Mission. Space Science Reviews. doi: 10.1007/s11214-013-9968-7 242
- Garcia-Sage, K., Moore, T. E., Pembroke, A., Merkin, V. G., & Hughes, W. J. 243 Modeling the effects of ionospheric oxygen outflow on bursty (2015, October). 244 Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 120, magnetotail flows. 245 8723-8737. doi: 10.1002/2015JA021228 246
- Gkioulidou, M., Ohtani, S., Ukhorskiy, A. Y., Mitchell, D. G., Takahashi, K., 247 (2019).Spence, H. E., ... Barnes, R. J. Low-energy (ikev) o+ ion out-248 flow directly into the inner magnetosphere: Van allen probes observations. 249 Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 124(1), 405-419. Retrieved 250
- from https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/ 251 2018JA025862 doi: 10.1029/2018JA025862 252
- Halford, A. J. (2012). EMIC Wave Association with Geomagnetic Storms, the Plas-253 masphere, and the Radiation Belts (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Uni-254 versity of Newcastle Australia, Callaghan NSW Australia. 255
- Halford, A. J., Fraser, B. J., Morley, S. K., Elkington, S. R., & Chan, A. A. (2016). 256 Dependence of emic wave parameters during quiet, geomagnetic storm, and 257 geomagnetic storm phase times. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space 258 *Physics*, 121(7), 6277–6291. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ 259 2016JA022694 (2016JA022694) doi: 10.1002/2016JA022694 260
- Halford, A. J., McGregor, S. L., Hudson, M. K., Millan, R. M., & Kress, B. T. 261 262
 - (2016).BARREL observations of a solar energetic electron and solar ener-

263	getic proton event. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 121(5),
264	4205-4216. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2016JA022462
265	(2016JA022462) doi: $10.1002/2016JA022462$
266	Halford, A. J., McGregor, S. L., Murphy, K. R., Millan, R. M., Hudson, M. K.,
267	Woodger, L. A., Fennell, J. F. (2015). BARREL observations of an
268	ICME-shock impact with the magnetosphere and the resultant radiation belt
269	electron loss. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics. Retrieved
270	from http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014JA020873 $(2014JA020873)$ doi:
271	10.1002/2014JA020873
272	Khazanov, G. V., Sibeck, D. G., & Zesta, E. (2017). Is diffuse aurora driven from
273	above or below: Geophysical Research Letters, $44(2)$, $641-647$. doi: $10.1002/2016CI 072062$
274	
275	Averkemp T Tyler I (2012 Nevember) The Floring and Magnetic
276	Field Instrument Suite and Integrated Science (FMEISIS) on PRSP
277	Fred first different Suite and integrated Science (EMITISIS) on RDS1. Space Science Reviewe $170(1)$ 127–181
278	Li W Bortnik I. Thorne P. M. Nishimura V. Angeleneulog V. & Chen I.
279	(2011) Modulation of whistler mode chorus waves: 2 role of density varia
280	tions Invertial of Geophysical Research: Space Physics $116(A6)$ n/a-n/a
201	Betrieved from http://dx doi $org/10 \ 1029/2010 IA016313 \ (A06206) \ doi:$
202	10.1029/2010JA016313
284	Mauk, B. H., Fox, N. J., Kanekal, S. G., Kessel, R. L., Sibeck, D. G., & Ukhorskiv,
285	A. (2012, Sep). Science objectives and rationale for the Radiation Belt Storm
286	Probes Mission. Space Science Reviews, 76. ((c) 2012: The Author(s)) doi:
287	10.1007/s11214-012-9908-y
288	Mays, M. L., Thompson, B. J., Jian, L. K., Colaninno, R. C., Odstrcil, D., Möstl,
289	C., Zheng, Y. (2015, October). Propagation of the 214 January 7 CME
290	and resulting geomangetic non-event. The Astrophysical Journal, 812(2), 145.
291	Meredith, N., Thorne, R., Horne, R., Summers, D., Fraser, B., & Anderson, R.
292	(2003, Jan). Statistical analysis of relativistic electron energies for cyclotron
293	resonance with EMIC waves observed on CRRES. Journal of Geophysical Re-
294	search, 108. (http://earth.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2003/2002JA009700.shtml)
295	Möstl, C., Rollett, T., Frahm, R. A., Liu, Y. D., Long, D. M., Colaninno, R. C.,
296	Vršnak, B. (2015, May). Strong coronal channelling and interplanetary
297	evolution of a solar storm up to Earth and Mars. Nature Communications, 6 ,
298	7135.
299	Ni, B., Thorne, R. M., Shprits, Y. Y., & Bortnik, J. (2008). Resonant scattering
300	of plasma sheet electrons by whistler-mode chorus: Contribution to diffuse
301	auroral precipitation. Geophysical Research Letters, 35(11), n/a–n/a. Re-
302	trieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2008GL034032 (L11100) doi:
303	10.1029/2006GL034032
304	Nose, M., Oliniatsu, S., Keika, K., Kietzing, C. A., Kuitti, W. S., Fascuale, S. D., Largon B. A. (2015) Formation of the ovurgen torus in the inner
305	magnetosphere: Van allen probes observations
300	Research: Space Physics 120(2) 1182-1196 Retrieved from https://
308	agunubs. onlinelibrary. wiley. com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014JA020593 doi:
309	10.1002/2014JA020593
310	Ouellette, J. E., Brambles, O. J., Lvon, J. G., Lotko, W., & Rogers, B. N.
311	(2013). Properties of outflow-driven sawtooth substorms. Journal of
312	Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 118(6), 3223–3232. Retrieved from
313	http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgra.50309 doi: 10.1002/jgra.50309
314	Rae, I. J., Murphy, K. R., Watt, C. E. J., Halford, A. J., Mann, I. R., Ozeke, L. G.,
315	Singer, H. J. (2018). The role of localized compressional ultra-low
316	frequency waves in energetic electron precipitation. Journal of Geophysi-
317	cal Research: Space Physics, 123(3), 1900-1914. Retrieved from https://

318	agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JA024674 doi:
319	10.1002/2017JA 024674
320	Redmon, R. J., Peterson, W. K., Andersson, L., Richards, P. G., & Yau, A. W.
321	(2014). An assessment of the role of soft electron precipitation in global ion
322	upwelling. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 119(9), 7665–7678.
323	Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014JA020061 (2014JA020061)
324	doi: $10.1002/2014$ JA020061
325	Seo, Y., Horwitz, J. L., & Caton, R. (1997). Statistical relationships between high-
326	latitude ionospheric F region/topside upflows and their drivers: DE 2 observa-
327	tions. Journal of Geophysical Research, 102, 7493. doi: 10.1029/97JA00151
328	Shultz, M., & Lanzerotti, L. (1974). Particle diffusion in the radiation belt. Springer,
329	New York.
330	Spence, H. E., Reeves, G. D., Baker, D. N., Blake, J. B., Bolton, M., Bourdarie, S.,
331	Thorne, R. M. (2013). Science Goals and Overview of the Radiation Belt
332	Storm Probes (RBSP) Energetic Particle, Composition, and Thermal Plasma
333	(ECT) Suite on NASA???s Van Allen Probes Mission. Space Science Reviews.
334	doi: \$10.1007/978-1-4899-7433-4_10\$
335	Su, YJ., Caton, R. G., Horwitz, J. L., & Richards, P. G. (1999). Systematic mod-
336	eling of soft-electron precipitation effects on high-latitude f region and topside
337	ionospheric upflows. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 104(A1),
338	153-163. Retrieved from https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/
339	abs/10.1029/1998JA900068 doi: 10.1029/1998JA900068
340	Su, Z., Zheng, H., & Wang, S. (2010). A parametric study on the diffuse auroral pre-
341	cipitation by resonant interaction with whistler mode chorus. Journal of Geo-
342	physical Research: Space Physics, 115(A5), n/a-n/a. Retrieved from http://
343	dx.doi.org/10.1029/2009JA014759 (A05219) doi: 10.1029/2009JA014759
344	Summers, D., Ni, B., & Meredith, N. P. (2007). Timescales for radiation belt elec-
345	tron acceleration and loss due to resonant wave-particle interactions: 1. The-
346	ory. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics (1978–2012), 112(A4),
347	A04206.
348	Zeng, W., & Horwitz, J. L. (2007). Formula representation of auroral ionospheric o+
349	outflows based on systematic simulations with effects of soft electron precipita-
350	tion and transverse ion heating. Geophysical Research Letters, 34(6), n/a-n/a.
351	Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2006GL028632 (L06103) doi:
352	10.1029/2006GL028632
353	Zhang, B., Lotko, W., Brambles, O., Wiltberger, M., Wang, W., Schmitt, P., &
354	Lyon, J. (2012). Enhancement of thermospheric mass density by soft electron
355	precipitation. Geophysical Research Letters, 39(20). Retrieved from https://
356	agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2012GL053519 doi:
357	10.1029/2012 GL 053519

-8-



Figure 1. Panel a) Observations of the Chorus wave observed at Van Allen Probe B after the shock arrival on 9 January 2014. The yellow vertical line is when the iCME first encountered the magnetosphere and the white vertical line is when the chorus wave turned on. The horizontal dotted lines are the electron cyclotron frequency and 1/2 the electron cyclotron frequency. Panels b, d, f, h: The local (solid line) and the bounce averaged (dashed line) pitch angle diffusion coefficients for the Chorus wave observed for energies of approximately 33 eV, 67 eV, 235 eV, and 660 eV respectively. The x-axis corresponds to diffusion timescales less than the length of the event. Panels c, e, g, and i) The flux normalised to the peak rate in the plotted time range for the corresponding energies observed by HOPE. The horizontal yellow dotted line is at a pitch angle of 90 deg to help aid the eye.



Figure 2. The averaged normalised pitch angle distribution for approximately 33, 66, 235, and 661 eV electrons (panels a - d) before the compression (dark blue lines), from the start of the compression till the start of the wave (green lines), and during the wave (red lines). Dashed lines show the bounce-averaged diffusion coefficients for the relevant energies.